डा० रामजी सिंह
संयोजक,

अभिनंदन

गाँधी शतवार्षिकी समिति
भागलपुर विश्वविद्यालय
३०-३१ जनवरी, '६८

आज ३० जनवरी है। २० वर्ष पूर्व आज ही के दिन राष्ट्रपिता बापू हमसे छिन गये थे! आज उनकी पुण्य-तिथि है। ऐसे गंभीर अवसर पर हम "आधुनिक युग में गाँधी विचार की सार्थकता" के उपर चर्चा करने के लिए जुटे हैं। हमारे हृदय में श्रद्धा भी है और हमारा मस्तिष्क भी खुला हुआ है। गाँधी आज कोई व्यक्ति नहीं बल्कि एक विचार के रूप में उपस्थित हैं। इसीलिये हमें विचार की चर्चा राग-द्वेष से मुक्त होकर करनी है। फिर विश्वविद्यालय तो सरस्वती का मंदिर है। यहाँ न गाँधी के प्रति अंध श्रद्धा अपेक्षित है न अंध उपेक्षा। लेकिन जिस प्रकार हम विश्व के सारे चिन्तकों का अध्ययन करते हैं, हम गाँधी विचार को जानने के लिये भी तो कम-से-कम उतना आग्रह रक्खें। अगले वर्ष गाँधीजी को इस संसार में आये हुए १०० वर्ष पूरे हो जायंगे। इस अवधि में हम उनके विचारों को कहाँ तक कार्यरूप दे सकेंगे, यह तो एक अलग प्रश्न है। किन्तु हम उनको अच्छी तरह जानें, यह तो अपेक्षित है ही! गाँधी शतवार्षिकी समिति की ओर से आयोजित इस विचार गोष्ठी का एक ही लक्ष्य है-गाँधी को हम माने न माने लेकिन जानें और जरूर जानें।"

बन्धुओ! आपलोगों का मैं हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ। जो विद्वान बाहर से आये हैं, उनका हम विशेष आभार मानते हैं। हमारा यह सौभाग्य है कि हमारे बीच गाँधीजी के एक अत्यन्त निकट के सहकर्मी और क्रांतिकारी विचारक आचार्य धीरेन मजुमदार यहाँ उपस्थित हैं। धीरेन भाई एक व्यक्ति नहीं बल्कि एक संस्था हैं। सुकरात की तरह नौजवानों से "गपशप" करना उनका "मूल उद्योग" है। वे शास्त्र की मर्यादा में बिना बँधे जिस तर्कबुद्धि से अपना विचार रखते हैं, वह उद्बोधक होता है। हम उनका विशेष स्वागत करते हुए उनसे इस "विचार गोष्ठी" का उद्घाटन करने के लिये विनम्र प्रार्थना करते हैं।

न अन्य पंथा :
(उद्घाटन भाषण)

३० जनवरी की पुण्य तिथि पर गांधी जी की विचार-धारा पर चर्चा करने के लिए हमलोग इकट्ठा हुए हैं। विषय है—"आधुनिक युग में गांधी विचार की सार्थकता" इसे समझना है। आज का जो युग है और युग की जो परिस्थिति है उसके साथ, अगर किसी विचार की संगति नहीं है तो उस विचार की सार्थकता नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिए पहले हमें इस बात को देखना है कि वर्तमान युग की समस्यायें क्या हैं, कोई नई परिस्थिति है कि नहीं और उन समस्याओं का मानव समाज पर चुनौती क्या है। हमें इस पर ध्यान देना है। अगर उस चुनौती के उत्तर के रूप में गांधी विचार प्रस्तुत होता है तो फिर उसकी सार्थकता (रेलिवेन्स) है, नहीं तो नहीं है। समाज के भिन्न-भिन्न पहलुओं पर हम नजर डालें तो मुख्य रूप से राजनैतिक, आर्थिक, सामाजिक और सांस्कृतिक पहलुओं पर विचार करना होगा और आपने इनको इस गोष्ठी में रख भी दिया है। उन पहलुओं से वर्तमान युग की परिस्थिति को देखना होगा। पहले हम राजनीति को ले लें। यह जमाना लोकतंत्र का जमाना है। इस युग की, जिसे हम आधुनिक युग कहते हैं, मुख्य प्राप्ति विज्ञान और लोकतंत्र की है। अगर हम गहराई से देखें तो विज्ञान का लोकतंत्र (Corollary) है, क्योंकि विज्ञान ने मानव समाज को यह मानने के लिए मजबूर कर दिया है कि चाहे किसी चीज का सहअस्तित्व (co-existence) हो, विज्ञान (Science) और हिंसा (violence) का सहअस्तित्व नहीं हो सकता।

तो हमें सोचना है कि हिंसात्मक शक्ति द्वारा मनुष्य के समाज के संतुलन की जो रक्षा होती थी, जैसे दंड-शक्ति, सैनिक-शक्ति, हिंसात्मक शक्ति द्वारा, वह ठीक था या नहीं। विज्ञान ने सारी दुनिया को, सारे जमाने को आज सोचने के लिए मजबूर कर दिया है कि आज निःशस्त्रीकरण अनिवार्य है और आवश्यक है। अगर निःशस्त्रीकरण अनिवार्य है, अगर विज्ञान मनुष्य को शस्त्रमुक्ति के लिए बाध्य कर रहा है, तो शस्त्र और सैनिक शक्ति की कोई शक्ति नहीं रह जाती है। तो फिर सैनिक शक्ति को विघटित करना होगा। सैनिक शक्ति के विघटन के साथ-साथ दण्ड-शक्ति शक्तिहीन हो जायेगी। उसके बाद समाज का गतितत्व (dynamics) क्या होगा ? जब से मनु आया है, जबसे मनुष्य ने समाज पर आविष्कार किया है, समाज के रूप में एक तत्व को उपस्थित किया है, तब से दण्ड-शक्ति ही मनुष्य की गति-शक्ति और धृति-शक्ति, दोनों रही है। निःशस्त्रीकरण के साथ वह शक्ति समाप्त होती है तो उसके विकल्प में कौन-सी शक्ति समाज धारण करेगा ? आखिर पृथ्वी कोई शुद्धतत्व (pure element) नहीं है, बल्कि वह सम्मिश्रण है, संस्कृति और विकृति का। विकृति नियंत्रण के लिए दंड के विकल्प में कौन-सी शक्ति समाज में हो सकती है, यह आज के युग में राजनैतिक चुनौती है। आप किसी भी वाद को मानें, गांधीवाद कहें, मार्क्सवाद कहें या कोई वाद कहें, इस चुनौती का उत्तर देने से आप भाग नहीं सकते। यह आज के युग की चुनौती है। यही गांधी कहता है। गांधी क्या कहता है, यह काल पुरुष कहता है। आप जानते हैं कि प्रकृति जिस

समय संतान को जन्म देती है, साथ-साथ माता के स्तन में दूध भी देता है। आप इतिहास में जाइये जिस समय जेम्सवाट ने वाष्पशक्ति का आविष्कार किया था, उसी समय मनुष्य के दिमाग में लोकतंत्र का विचार आया। यह कोई आकस्मिक घटना नहीं है, यह एक संयोग मात्र है। यह काल की या भगवान की योजना है। लोकतंत्र ने कहा कि दुनिया की समस्याओं का हल, दुनिया का निर्णय सिर फोड़ के नहीं बल्कि सिर गिन के करना पड़ेगा। अगर वाष्पशक्ति का आविष्कार, अणुशक्ति और वाष्पशक्ति की कुरूप सूचना है, तो उस समय मनुष्य के दिमाग में उसकी समस्या या चिंता जो पैदा होने वाली है, उसका उत्तर भी उसी समय मनुष्य के दिमाग में घुस गया है। तब फिर समाज का गतितत्व (dynamics) दबाव (coercion) नहीं बल्कि सहमति (consent) है, यह बात मनुष्य समाज के सामने आई है। "Democracy is a process from coercion to consent." यह जो लोकतंत्र के विचार है, यह जो समाज के डायनामिक्स के रूप में coercion के स्थान पर consent आवश्यक है, यह साइंस के चैलेन्ज का उत्तर है। यह तो एक समय से आ रहा है। गांधी ने उसको एक व्यवहार के रूप में समाज में प्रयोग करने का प्रयास किया। उन्होंने कोई नया विचार नहीं दिया। यह लोकतंत्र का विचार है। गांधी ने कहा दण्डशक्ति अगर छोड़नी है तो राजनीति को अध्यात्मोन्मुख (spiritualise) करना होगा। नैतिक और आध्यात्मिक शक्ति ही दण्डशक्ति का विकल्प हो सकती है, क्योंकि संस्कृति और विकृति के नियंत्रण और विकास की टेक्नोलौजी दण्डशक्ति रही है। उस टेक्नोलौजी के मूल विचार को हिंसा या दंडशक्ति कहते हैं। हम अंग्रेजी में कहते हैं "To engage a greater thief to catch a thief." विकृति, उसको दण्डशक्ति और सैनिकशक्ति के रूप में संगठित विकृति द्वारा नियंत्रित करती है। यही टेक्नोलौजी रही है। डिमोक्रेसी ने कहा और गांधी ने प्रत्यक्ष रूप में हमारे सामने यह रखा कि अगर विकृति को नियंत्रित करना है, तो विकृति को महा-विकृति द्वारा नहीं, बल्कि संगठित संस्कृति द्वारा विकृति को नियंत्रित करना होगा। तो राजनीति (politics) का आध्यात्मीकरण (spiritualisation) होगा। दण्डशक्ति के स्थान पर आध्यात्मिक शक्ति को स्थापित करना होगा और संगठित करना होगा, व्यक्तिगत जीवन के साधना के रूप में नहीं, बल्कि समाज के डायनामिक्स के रूप में। यह पहली बात गांधी जी ने कही। गांधी जी से पहले यह सूक्ष्म और बीज रूप में लोकतंत्र के विचार में रहा लेकिन वह सिद्ध हो नहीं सका, इसलिए कि पहले के ऋषियों ने साध्य-साधन पर ध्यान नहीं दिया। गांधी जी ने कहा कि जैसा साध्य (ends) हो उसके अनुसार साधन (means) होगा। इसी तरह के समाज में आदर्श (idealogy) के अनुसार उद्योग (technology) भी होना चाहिए। लोकतंत्र के विचार के लिए बहुत से लोगों ने कुर्बानियाँ कीं, संघर्ष किया और राजतंत्र को समाप्त किया। लेकिन उस समय के ऋषियों को और नेताओं को इस बात का एहसास नहीं हुआ कि साध्य के अनुसार साधन होना चाहिए और आदर्श के अनुरूप उद्योग का आविष्कार करना होगा। उन्होंने राजतंत्र की टेकनोलौजी से लोकतंत्र को चलाने का

प्रयास किया। राजतंत्र की टेक्नोलौजी क्या रही है ? राजा जिम्मेवार है समाज को सुचारु-रूप से चलाने के लिये। राजा को समाज की जिम्मेवारी के लिये देश के मुख्य व्यक्तियों को मंत्रि-मंडल बनाकर अपने पास बुलाना है और सैनिक शक्ति तथा अमलातंत्र द्वारा समाज के यंत्र को चलाना है। सैनिक शक्ति Power और अमलातंत्र Technology है। Power and Technology सैनिक शक्ति और अमलातंत्र ही राजतंत्र का Power and Technology रही है। लेकिन उन्होंने यह नहीं देखा कि अगर लोकतंत्र को चलाना है तो सारी Technology और सारी Technique और सारे Power को लोकमूलक बनना है तंत्रमूलक नहीं। इसलिये गांधीजी ने नई बात लोकतंत्र की कही, क्योंकि उन्होंने देखा कि अगर राजतंत्र, यानी एकतंत्र की Technology से लोकतंत्र चलाना है, लोकतंत्र में भी अगर सैनिक शक्ति द्वारा ही समाज का संतुलन रखना है; लोकतंत्र में भी केन्द्र संगठित नौकरशाही से ही चलाना है, तो सारी शक्ति केन्द्रित करके राजा के स्थान पर लोक द्वारा चुने हुए व्यक्तियों के हाथ में सत्ता लानी होगी, यानी लोकतंत्र लोकपसन्द तंत्र के रूप में परिणत करना होगा। अब चूंकि सारी शक्ति केन्द्र में रही, जैसे राजतंत्र में रही, नतीजा यह हुआ, उस लोकतंत्र को केन्द्र में अवस्थित कर दिया और पूंजीपति ने उसको दखल कर लिया और दुनिया के जितने लोकतांत्रिक देश हैं वे पूंजीवादी लोकतंत्र हो गए। इस लोकतंत्र के 'लोक' पूंजीपतियों के शोषण के नीचे दब गये। ऐसी हालत में उस हिंसाशक्ति और उस दबाव की शक्ति से आप बाहर नहीं निकल सकते थे। केन्द्र द्वारा दबाकर अगर लोगों को चलाना है तो हिंसा ही एकमात्र शक्ति हो सकती है। केन्द्र की शक्ति कोई अहिंसक शक्ति नहीं हो सकती। केन्द्र की अहिंसक शक्ति दबाव (authority) नहीं चला सकती। उसको सैनिक शक्ति ही कर सकती है। नतीजा यह हुआ कि १९४५ से आज १९६८ तक यानी २३ साल से दुनिया में निःशस्त्रीकरण (disarmament) कमिटियाँ बनती जा रही हैं, लेकिन २३ साल से शस्त्रों की होड़ (armament race बढ़ती ही जा रही है। ऐसा क्यों ? इसलिये कि आज टेक्नोलौजी के कारण सारी दुनिया ने लोकतंत्र को राजतंत्र के तरीके पर चलाने का प्रयास किया। गांधी ने कहा कि सारे लोकतंत्र के ढाँचे को बदलना होगा। समाज का जो संगठन होगा। वह वर्त्तुलाकर (Oceanic circle) होगा। वर्त्तुल (oceanic circle) में वृत्त (circle) बढ़ता चलेगा और जैसे-जैसे वृत्त बढ़ता जायगा, वैसे-वैसे वह विलीन होता जायगा, धीमा होता जायगा, क्षीण होता जायगा। लेकिन आज जो लोकतंत्र चल रहा है एकतंत्र के तरीके से, वह टार्च लाइट torch light जैसा है। एक जगह बल्ब में प्रकाश केन्द्रित है—फिर जैसे-जैसे आगे बढ़ता जायगा, वह डिम होता जायगा, धीमा होता जायगा। सैनिक तंत्र के राज-केन्द्र में अधिक-से-अधिक प्रकाश होगा और होते-होते लोकतंत्र के लोक के पास जाते-जाते अन्धकार हो जायगा। गांधी ने कहा सारी शक्ति उस लोक के साथ होनी चाहिए और उसको बढ़ते-बढ़ते अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में जाकर विलीन होना चाहिए जैसे वर्त्तुल (oceanic circle) का हाल होता है। यह पहली बात गाँधी ने इस टेक्नोलौजी के संबंध में कही।

राजनैतिक क्षेत्र में आकर अगर हम निःशस्त्रीकरण (disarmament) को सफल बताने की कोशिश करें तो दबाव (Coercion) की जगह पर हर क्षेत्र में सहमति (Consent) को ले आना होगा और यदि सहमति (concent) लायेंगे तो संचालन-पद्धति को छोड़कर सहकारी पद्धति या सामूहिक पद्धति को लाना ही पड़ेगा —यानी सामूहिक-संकल्प, सामूहिक-निर्णय। यह एक बात है जिसपर आपलोग चर्चा करेंगे और देखेंगे कि कह वहाँ तक सार्थक (relevant) होती है, क्योंकि इस युग की मांग निःशस्त्रीकरण (disarmament) है। अब शस्त्रीकरण (armament) की जगह निस्त्रीकरण की मांग है जिसमें दंडशक्ति का निराकरण है। तो विकल्प में जो शक्ति आयगी वह आध्यात्मिक (spiritual) शक्ति शिक्षण (education) शक्ति होगी, वह विचार परिवर्तन persuation शक्ति या हृदय-परिवर्तन (conversion) की शक्ति होगी। उसको आप रुपायित कैसे करेंगे ? उसका आप सिलेबस कैसे बनायेंगे ? उसका विधान कैसे लायेंगे ? इन बातों पर आपको सोचना है ही, दिशा-निर्देश गाँधी ने कर दिया है।

विज्ञान के इस युग की दूसरी चुनौती है अर्थिक उत्पादन के क्षेत्र में। पहले तकली थी और चर्खा था। औद्योगिक क्रांति के बाद विज्ञान ने बड़े-बड़े यंत्र बनाये। इन यंत्रों के कारण लोगों के हाथों को बेकार कर दिया और बेकार करता चला गया। केन्द्रित उद्योग हुआ, अभिनवीकरण (rationalisation) तथा स्वयं संचालित यंत्रीकरण (automation) हुआ और साइबरनेशन तक पहुँच गया। भौतिक क्षेत्र के दायरे में एलेकट्रोनिक (electronic) कमप्युटर की तरफ जा रहे हैं। आपलोग अध्यापक हैं, आपके क्षेत्र में शायद आक्रमण हुआ नहीं होगा। अभी टेलीवीजन नहीं आया है अन्यथा जितनी भाषायें हैं, उतनी भाषाओं के एक-एक प्रोफेसर सारे देश को पढ़ाने के लिये काफी होंगे। तो आज के आधुनिक युग में समाज को जिन्दगी में साइबरनेशन, इलेक्ट्रोनाइजेशन तथा टेलीवीजन की चुनौती है। साइबरनेशन के जो माहिर हैं उनका कहना है कि अगर आज अमेरिका में साइबरनेशन की पद्धति से पूरा इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन हो जाय तो अमेरिका के सारे प्रोडक्शन के लिये ३०० आदमी काफी होंगे। जब ३०० आदमी ही काफी हैं, तो बाकी आदमी क्या करेंगे ? सिद्धान्त तो यह है कि तब मनुष्य अपना सांस्कृतिक विकास करेगा, अधिक-से-अधिक नाचेगा, गायेगा और कूदेगा। लेकिन फिर law of diminishing return भी लागू होगा यानी अवकाश (लीजर) के कंस्ट्रक्टिव युटिलाइजेशन में भी law of diminishing return लागू होगा। जिस point पर अवकाश के रचनात्मक उपयोग का अंतिम बिन्दु (saturation point) आ जायगा उससे यदि एक सेकन्ड भी अधिक लीजर होगा तो विध्वंसात्मक उपयोग (destructive utilization) होगा। तो यह साइबरनेशन की चुनौती है, कमप्युटर की चुनौती है और टेलीवीजन की चुनौती है। हर क्षेत्र में मनुष्य को जो हटाया (replace) करता है, वह मशीन है। यही बात आर्थिक जिन्दगी में है तो करना क्या है ? क्या वह स्थिति और आगे जायगी ? अवकाश (leisure) का सांस्कृतिक विकास जैसे-जैसे होगा, उसका अधिक-से-अधिक रचनात्मक उपयोग होगा ? माना, लेकिन आखिर में सेचुरेशन प्वायन्ट पर

जायगा, जिसके बाद डिमिनिशिग रिटंन शुरू होगा, तब क्या होगा ? यह प्रश्न है आजके आधुनिक युग की समस्याओं का। तब गांधी कहता है कि साइंस को छोड़ना नहीं है, और मानव शक्ति (human power) को हटाना (replace) नहीं है। तो करना क्या है ? इसका उत्तर है चर्खा। चर्खा अहिंसा का प्रतीक है। यदि राजनैतिक बिन्दु की रक्षा करनी है, या वर्त्तुलाकर रूप से सारे पॉलिटिक्स का निर्माण करना है तो उत्पादन (production) का भी बिकेन्द्रीकरण करना होगा। समाज उत्पादन की प्रक्रिया पर निर्भर करता है और उत्पादन की प्रक्रिया उत्पादन के साधन एवं तंत्र पर निर्भर होता है। (Society depends on the mode of production and the mode of production depends on the means and the instruments of production) तो चर्खा अर्थनीति की बुनियाद है, अहिंसा का प्रतीक है। साइंस के युग में निःशस्त्रीकरण की आवश्यकता के युग में यदि हर वैज्ञानिक अहिंसा की बात करता तो गांधी की जरूरत नहीं पड़ती। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं है। लोग हमसे पूछते हैं कि साइंस के युग में चर्खा चलेगा ? गाँधी कहता है कि चूंकि यह साइंस का युग है इसलिए चर्खा अवश्य चलेगा क्योंकि विकेन्द्रित अर्थव्यवस्था है। गांधी के विचार में चर्खा मूल अर्थनीति है। पुराना और कुरुप चर्खा नहीं। साइंस का रिसर्च हाथ को खाली करने के लिये नहीं, हाथ को बेकार बनाने के लिए नहीं, बल्कि हाथ को आनन्द देने के लिये होना चहिए। उत्पादन का प्रोसेस कैसे आनन्ददायक हो, कैसे आरामदायक हो उसके लिये रिसर्च होना चाहिए। साइंस को उसी दिशा में जाना चाहिए। गाँधी कहता था वैज्ञानिक चर्खा, पहले का कुरूप चर्खा नहीं। चर्खा आवश्यक है आज के साइंस के इकोनौमिक चैलेन्ज के लिये। बौद्धिक एवं शारीरिक बेरोजगारी की चुनौती का अगर उत्तर देना है तो गाँधी के वैज्ञानिक अर्थनीति की ओर जाना होगा।

तीसरी बात सामाजिक चुनौती की मैंने ऊपर कही है और वह है सामाजिक चुनौती और दक्ष-शूद्र-चेतना। चाहे अमेरिका का मजदूर नीग्रो हो, चाहे हिन्दुस्तान का हरिजन हो, चाहे दुनिया का मजदूरवर्ग हो, अब प्राचीनकाल की वर्ण-व्यवस्था चल नहीं सकती। शूद्र-चेतना इस युग की सामाजिक चुनौती है। मालिक-मजदूर का वर्गभेद, अमीर-गरीब का वर्गभेद, और बुद्धिजीवी और श्रमजीवी का वर्ग भेद इस सार्वजनिक लोक-चेतना के युग में, इस ज्ञान-विज्ञान के विकास के युग में, अब चल नहीं सकता है। इसलिए समाज के ढाँचे को उलटना और बदलना होगा। लेनिन ने मालिक-मजदूर के वर्गभेद को मिटाने के लिये लाखों को कत्ल कराया। इधर क्रुश्चेव साहब रोते हुए गये कि हमारे देश में सफेदपोश (white colour) का विकास हो रहा है जो एक समस्या है। यानी बुद्धि-जीवी और श्रमजीवी के वर्गों का विकास। मालिक मजदूर का पेट काटता है। बुद्धिजीवी का जो अपमान दिन रात करता रहता है वह कम नहीं है। हमारे आश्रम में एक बढ़ई काम करता है और महीना में ३००–४०० रुपया कमाता है। उसके लड़के ने मैट्रिक पास किया और मुझसे आकर कहा कि इसको कॉलेज में भर्त्ती नहीं कर रहे हैं। मैंने कहा कि बी० ए० पास करके केवल १००) रु० तनखाह पायेगा, तुम तो ३००–४०० रुपया कमा

लेते हो। वह मैट्रिक पास कर गया है तो और अच्छी तरह से बढ़इगिरी करेगा। बढ़इगिरी क्यों नहीं सिखाते हो? वह बोला कि बाबू, ४०० रुपया तो मिलेगा, परन्तु कुर्सी नहीं मिलेगी। अब वह १००) रु० की तकलीफ सहकर भी बाबू बनना चाहता है। वह एक मजदूर है, परन्तु बाबू न बनकर कॉलेज में जाकर गुलाम बनने का प्रयास करता है। १००) रु० में क्लर्की करेगा बी० ए० पास करके, लेकिन श्रमजीवी मालिक, बुद्धिजीवी मजदूर होना ज्यादा पसन्द करेगा, क्योंकि वह श्रमजीवी मालिक बुद्धिजीवी द्वारा निरंतर हमारे समाज में अपमानित होता रहता है। तो वर्गभेद का मलिक मजदूर का एक पहलू है और बुद्धिजीवी-श्रमजीवी दूसरा पहलू है। लेनिन को मालिक-मजदूर भेद मिटाने के लिये लोगों को कतल कराना पड़ा, मगर वह हुआ नहीं। आज सांस्कृतिक रेवोल्यूशन करके बुद्धिजीवी–श्रमजीवी का भेद मिटाने के लिये, प्रयास हो रहा है, परन्तु उसमें उन्हें कितनी सफलता मिल रही है, हमलोग अखबारों में पढ़ रहे हैं। इतिहास बतायेगा कि इसका नतीजा क्या होगा। तो गाँधी ने कहा वर्ग-संघर्ष (class war) नहीं वर्ग-निराकरण (class transformation) होना चाहिए। बुद्धिजीवी और श्रमजीवी का भेद जिस दिन मिटेगा, उस दिन मालिक-मजदूर का भेद मिटेगा। इसलिये उन्होंने शैक्षिक पुनर्रचना (educational reconstruction) की। शिक्षा का माध्यम उत्पादन की प्रक्रिया होगी। तो फिर हरेक आदमी बुद्धिजीवी श्रमिक (intellectual bread labour) होगा। वह आज जैसा श्रमिक (bread labourer) नहीं होगा, वह वैज्ञानिक होगा। तो गाँधी ने कहा "हर स्वस्थ मनुष्य को रोटी के लिये शरीर-श्रम करना ही है। बुद्धि को समाज-सेवा में लगाना होगा।" यह गाँधी का समाज-विचार है, आज के वर्गभेद के संबंध में। वर्गविहीन समाज (Classless society) आज जमाने की मांग है। गाँधीजो ने जो सामाजिक विचार या उसके लिये जो टेक्निक दिया जो शिक्षा की प्रक्रिया दी वह है उत्पादन का माध्यम (useful productivity should be the medium of instruction)। वर्गभेद नहीं और वर्ग-संघर्ष नहीं बल्कि वर्ग-निराकरण एवं वर्ग-समन्वय होना चाहिए। यह हिंसा मुक्ति के संदर्भ में भी और समाज के वर्ग-निराकरण की दशा में भी लागू करना होगा।

चौथी बात सांस्कृतिक दिशा के संबंध में कहनी है। यह आखरी बात कहकर में अपना भाषण खत्म कर रहा हूँ। मनुष्य आज तरक्की कर रहा है इसमें मतभेद है, लेकिन टोटल में मनुष्य आज विकसित हो रहा है इससे कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता। तो जैसे डार्विन साहब ने शारीरिक विकास को बात कही थी उसी तरह लोक-चेतना में विकास हो रहा है, मनस-तत्व में भी विकास हो रहा है। सांस्कृतिक विकास में अधिक प्राचीन काल में मनुष्य जंगली जानवर के स्टेज में थे। फिर मनु भगवान को बुलाया, यानी दंडा और दंडिका का आविष्कार किया, राज्य और राजा का आविष्कार किया। इस तरह से सभ्यता का विकास हुआ, अमन और चैन आया, जंगलीपन खत्म हुआ। लेकिन कितना विकास हुआ? जंगली जानबर के स्टेज से गुजर कर सर्कस के जानवर के स्टेज पर पहुँच गया जिसमें ताकत की चाबुक से हो शांति की गारंटी दी जा सकती है। Ring

master's whip is the only guarantee for peace.) मनुष्य क्या वहीं तक रहेगा, या सभ्यता के विकास के साथ आगे बढ़ेगा, वह विकसित हो रहा है यह नहीं ? प्राकृतिक नियम उसको विकास की ओर ले जा रहा है। सर्कस के जानवर के स्टेज पर से मनुष्य टोली में प्रवेश करने की आकांक्षा मनुष्य की होती है और हो रही है। तब फिर निरपेक्ष समाज बनाना है। तो समाज के सांस्कृतिक विकास के लिए अहिंसा समाज का गतितत्व (dynamics) होना चाहिए। पहले जब प्रारम्भिक चेतना थी, तो वह देवताओं का युग था। मनुष्य का विज्ञान बढ़ा चेतना बढ़ी, तो देवताओं का जमाना गया, देवताओं की पोल खुल गयी। देवताओं पर से आस्था गई। अब होते-होते साइंस के विकास के साथ चर्खा और तकली का विकास अनिवार्य हो गया। चेतना का बौद्धिक व्यवधान कम हो गया है और शक्ति मर्यादित हो गई है समाज के सम्बन्ध में। अब नेताओं का जमाना खत्म हो रहा है। चुनाव के क्षेत्र में इंगलैंड के प्राइम मिनिस्टर की आँख फूटती है और भारत के प्राइम मिनिस्टर की नाक टूटती है। देवताओं का जमाना खत्म हुआ, राजाओं का जमाना खत्म हुआ और अब नेताओं का जमाना खत्म हो रहा है।

सामूहिक लोक-चेतना, सामूहिक-चिंतन और सामूहिक-संकल्प द्वारा ही समाज को चलाना होगा। आज गांधी के मंत्र से विनोबा भावे ग्रामदान और ग्रामसेवा का संदेश दे रहे हैं। सामूहिक-संकल्प, सामूहिक-चिंतन, सामूहिक-व्यवस्था और सामूहिक-पुरुषार्थ से समाज को चलाना होगा। यह सांस्कृतिक परिस्थिति आज की है जिसके लिये गांधीजी के विचार के सिवा दूसरा कोई मार्ग नहीं है।

इतने थोड़े समय में ज्यादा बात नहीं कही जा सकती। लेकिन मैंने समाज की समस्याओं के भिन्न-भिन्न पहलुओं पर आपका ध्यान आकृष्ट किया है। तात्पर्य यह है कि आधुनिक युग के लिये केवल गांधीजी का विचार ही हमलोगों के लिये मार्गदर्शन हो सकता है और आज केवल गांधी-विचार की ही सार्थकता है।

Dr. N. Jha
Vice-Chairman,
Gandhi Centenary Committee,
Bhagalpur University.

IMPORTANCE OF GANDHIAN STUDIES :

(PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS)

Ladies and Gentlemen,

For many years now interest in Gandhiji's ideas, economic and political, as also in other fields has been on the wane. People call him Father of the Nation, and still credit him for the work he did for India's freedom, but treat many of his economic and political ideas as unpractical and utopian. This is to our great loss. Gandhii's work for India's freedom was just a part of his greater aim of establishment of an exploitation-free and decentralised economy and of developing India's natural and human resources to the maximum extent possible for the service of mankind. He worked ceaselessly for realisation of per ennial moral values in the individual & in Society and emphasised many things such as self sufficiency in food and clothing even for small regions in the Country, and utmost economy, everywhere, and in all things, which appear so much more meaningful in the present context. Above all, his life was and would always be a great source of inspiration and hope, a lesson for us all, as he was a man of God and a great Karm Yogi. All this is now being generally forgotten in the mad rush for material things we are all after. A new generation is here who never saw him nor heard him except for his recorded voice on Friday mornings on the Radio. For many of our young men & women, he is fast becoming a dead or a dying myth. It is thus, in the fitness of things that a Seminar on the broad theme of contemporary relevance of Gandhiji's life and ideas has been organised at this University. I hope that the Conference will be able to discuss Gandhiji's ideas in their various aspects, and would be able to draw useful lessons from them for many of our contemporary problems both individual & social. In Gandhiji, (as you all know) religion, ethics, economics, politics are all inextricably linked up. They would certainly be if the aim was practice, and their application for the transformation of the Indian Society and of its political and economic status. I think that their interdependence in his scheme of thought made his contribution to these areas of knowledge and action far more real and valuable than they would have otherwise been. And it will be useful if we constantly

remember or at least keep at the back of our minds that Gandhiji's belief and his contributions to these areas of knowledge as also all that he himself did were all of one piece informed by his great faith and trust in God and his deep love for every living thing and by his faith in truth and non-violence.

श्री अमरेन्द्र नारायण,
कुल-सचिव
भागलपुर विश्वविद्यालय

धन्यवाद ज्ञापन

इस समारोह के उद्घाटन के लिये मैं धीरेन भाई को विश्वविद्यालय की ओर से धन्यवाद देता हूँ। धीरेन भाई को आज ४० वर्षों से सुनता आया हूँ। उनसे मिलने का भी कई बार सौभाग्य हुआ है। वे गाँधीजी के बहुत निकट रहे हैं और गाँधीजी के विचार से पूरी तरह से अवगत हैं। इसलिये ऐसे व्यक्ति को इस अवसर पर अपने बीच पाकर हमें बड़ा हर्ष हो रहा है। आपने स्वयं देखा होगा कि गाँधीजी की विचार-धारा से हमारे देश, हमारे समाज और हमारे समाज के विभिन्न पहलुओं पर किस प्रकार से प्रभाव पड़ा है, उसकी संक्षेप में जो रूपरेखा धीरेन भाई ने प्रस्तुत की है वह कितनी सुन्दर और यथेष्ट है। धीरेन भाई को मैं पुनः इसके लिये धन्यवाद देता हूँ। साथ अन्य अतिथियों का भी मैं आभार मानता हूँ जिन्होंने इस गोष्ठी में भाग लेकर हमारा उत्साह बढ़ाया है।

N. Mishra
Head of the Deptt. of Philosophy,
Bhagalpur University.

GANDHI'S GOD

The world-situation to-day is very grave. The volcano of a global war may erupt any moment. Already in Vietnam a war is going on and it may entangle more and more countries and may finally encompass the whole world. Recent happenings in the Red Sea and the desert of Sinai and the earlier happenings on the borders between India and Pakistan and between India and China may prove to be preludes to an internecine world-war. And the world-war this time will be a nuclear war for strategic reasons. What the upshot of the next world-war will be can not be easily imagined. May be, the human race will be wiped out of existence. Even if it will survive, it will prove to be an unbearable burden on itself on account of its manifold impairments, disabilities and ailments.

If the world-situation is as bad as that, the situation in our own country is no better. Gandhi left us exactly 20 years ago. But it appears that there never was a time when Gandhi lived in this land of Bharat. We have become indifferent and apathetic to his teachings and the time is fast coming when only after a deep painstaking research it will be possible for any one to say what Gandhi taught and preached. Well, I am not here to give you a graphic description of the gloomy picture of the India of to-day. You all know the morass in which she has fallen. I may only remind you of the happenings galore in the Parliament and legislatures, political meetings and parleys, universities and examination halls, railway trains and buses, offices and streets, business markets and social platforms. Political defections and bribery, communal strifes, language fanaticism, lawlessness and disorder have become the normal features of the Indian body-politic to-day. Right from the Centre down to small villages and families the forces of hatred and jealousy and spite and ill-will are corroding the structure of corporate life and the result is bound to be disastrous.

I do not want to say that, when Gandhi lived, India was a veritable paradise and it is only to-day that the evils have suddenly sprung up. If, by a miracle, Gandhi could be in our midst once again, it is not that he would not be able to recognise the people of India. But he will surely be disappointed and shocked. For, in his life-time, he

had trained us to fight the various kinds of evils, and to make all manners of sacrifice to defeat and eradicate them. We had responded to his training fairly well and our outlook in respect of human values and ideals had, under his influence, changed for the better. And it was hoped that the consciousness that he aroused in us would grow further and develop on the lines chartered by him. But surprisingly enough, exactly the opposite has happened. Already our minds have become so perverted that we have started doubting the efficacy and relevance of Gandhism in modern times, and you see that we have assembled here to-day to debate whether Gandhism has any relevance after all.

Within the short time at my disposal it will not be possible for me to enter into a detailed and comprehensive discussion of this subject. It is very vast and has many facets. What I intened to do on this occasion is to talk on just one topic, viz., Gandhi's concept of God. I have selected this topic because it appears to me that Gandhism minus God is nothing. There is also a personal reason. As a student of philosophy I have always found Gandhi's concept of God somewhat baffling. Gandhi was not a professional philosopher and he did not form his concepts in a strictly technical way. Sometimes, therefore, it becomes difficult for the professional philosopher to categorise Gandhi's concepts in their own way and be very clear and difinite about them.

Let us take Gandhi's concept of God. It will not be an exaggeration to say that Gandhi was a God-intoxicated man. His ambition in life was to realise God. He wanted to see God face to face. His holding of prayer meetings, his emphasis on making prayers to God, his ideas of self-surrender and divine grace, his viewing of God as a maker or creator of the world, etc. etc., may indicate that God according to him is a person. But a closer scrutiny reveals that he did not accept a personal God. Although he uses the pronoun "He" or "Him" while referring to God, he does so on account of linguistic convention. He has categorically said at several places that God is not a person.

Gandhi did not accept a plurality of Gods either. He says "I believe that I am a thorough Hindu but I never believe in many gods. Never even in my childhood did I hold that belief, and no one ever taught me to do so." Thus we see that according to Gandhi there is only one God and that he is not a person. But then the question arises ; What according to him is the nature of God ?

It is well-known to the readers of the Gandhian literature that Gandhi made a subtle distinction between the statements 'God is Truth' and 'Truth is God'. It is also well-known that formerly he accepted *God* as Truth, but later on he regarded *Truth* as God. He says, "If it is possible for the human tongue to give the fullest description of God, I have come to the conclusion that for myself, God is Truth. But two years ago I went a step further and said that Truth is God. You will see the fine distinction between the two statements, viz., that God is Truth and Truth is God. And I came to that conclusion after a continuous and relentless search after Truth which began nearly fifty years ago." So we find that for Gandhi Truth is the more basic and more important concept. We may very well use the divine terminology if we like, but it is not indispensable. He says, "I never found a double meaning in connection with Truth and even atheists had not demurred to the necessity or power of truth. But in their passion for discovering truth, the atheists have not hesitated to deny the very existence of God—from their own point of view rightly. And it was because of this reasoning that I saw that rather than say that God is Truth I should say that Truth is God."

Now, what is Truth ? We, the modern students of philosophy, regard truth as a property of propositions and we say that a proposition acquires the property of truth if the conditions necessary for its acquiring that property are fulfilled. Obviously, this conception of truth is not the same as Gandhi's conception of truth. Truth for him is an existential concept. At one place he says, "On deeper thinking, it will be realised that *sat* or *satya* is the only correct and fully significant name for God." You will notice that the atheists can and do deny God, but they cannot deny existence. So existence being undeniable is Truth. One may still use the divine terminology if he likes, but he should use it for existence, for truth.

Thus we find that Gandhi dispenses with the usual conceptions of God. He dispenses with the many gods of polytheism and also the one personal God of theism. And in order to accommodate atheism he is prepared to do away with the very concept of God. And if for nostalgic reasons God has to be retained, he must be retained as truth, as *sat*, as existence.

But our inquisitive mind is not yet satisfied. We would still want to know what this existence or truth is, for which Gandhi made

experiments throughout his life and for the sake of which he embraced the assassin's bullet and sacrificed himself.

Gandhi's truth is difinitely not an abstract concept. It is very much concrete and it appears to me that it has two very important aspects. One is its metaphysical aspect and the other moral. Metaphysically, it is, according to Gandhi, force, power or law. As force, power or law it unites, binds, or harmonises. Gandhi says, "This is called cohesion or attraction in scientific language. In popular language it is called love." This cohesive force cannot be denied even by atheists. For if it were not operative, the world could not be what it in fact is— a system, a cosmos, an order of interrelated and interdependent things. The continued holding of the multiplicity of things as one world is possible because of this cohesive force which may be variously named as the principle of mutual immanence, the principle of relativity, the principle of dialectical synthesis, etc. etc. Gandhi says, "Though there is enough repulsion in nature, she *lives* by attraction. Mutual love enables Nature to persist" Thus we may say that truth in one aspect is the principle of cohesion or harmony.

Another aspect of truth is the aspect of value. If the basic existential character of truth is harmony or cohesion, then, on existential grounds, this character must be constitutive of worth or value. The great universal harmony, therefore, is the good. *Satyam* is also *Shivam*. Gandhi perhaps rightly thinks that an atheist may very well deny God, but he cannot deny value or worth and perhaps no sane atheist ever does so. The atheist does make a distinction between right and wrong, good and bad. His ascription of rightness or wrongness, goodness or badness to actions and things may differ from that of others. But he cannot just wipe out the distinction between right and wrong, good and bad.

But then if the above metaphysical aspect of truth is accepted, there cannot be any arbitrary decision of what is good or what is bad. It is harmony or cohesion which will be the determiner of value. This harmony in its axiological aspect may be called love. Now, love, devoid of its proper existential moorings, may degrade itself into self-love, selfish love and selfishness. Lest this may happen, love must always remain tempered or charged with the existential aspect of truth. Love so charged will be true love, just love. The existential aspect, therefore, is the determiner of justness or justice. And we may say that another name for truth is justice. The title "My experiments

with Truth" that Gandhi gave to his autobiography refers to the various experiments that he performed for justice, for the victory of justice.

It appears then that Gandhi's Truth is not a vacuous concept. It denotes existential cohesion, love and justice. I am reminded here of an analogous concept which the Vedic seers sang about — the concept of *Rta*. In the words of Radhakrishnan, "*Rta* literally means 'the course of things'. It stands for law in general and the immanence of justice *Rta* denotes the order of the world. Everything that is ordered in the universe has *Rta* for its principle .. Soon this cosmic order becomes....the law of morality and righteousness as well.... Gradually it became the path of morality to be followed by man and the law of righteousness observed even by gods." I think Gandhi's Truth has a very close similarity with Vedic *Rta*. As this *Rta* is not a person, so also Gandhi's Truth is not a person. Like *Rta* Truth explains both existence and morality. And it is to this that Gandhi loved to give the name of God. But the term 'God' may be misunderstood and it may be objected to by the atheists. So he preferred to say that Truth is God, rather than God is Truth. And it is fairly obvious that without this conception of Truth, that is, without the God of Gandhi's conception, Gandhism is meaningless.

Now, is this Gandhism relevant to-day ? I think it is. What is the root cause of the present-day crisis ? I think it is the narrow, self-oriented way of looking at and dealing with things. We have become so selfishly-oriented that we always think in terms of our own selves, our own families, our own kinsmen, our own castes, our own religions, our own languages, our own parties, our own countries and so on. This dichotomising of humanity into "mine" and "thine" is, I think, at the root of all the troubles that I referred to at the outset. And doing this is surely going against Gandhi's Truth, that is, going against Harmony, Love and Justice. I fail to understand how else the prevailing crisis can be got over; if not through the Gandhian way. If we really want to get out and get rid of the slough we are in to-day, we have no other alternative but to adopt and embrace and practise Gandhism. Gandhism is the need of the hour. And when I say this I mean by Gandhism only its essentials or fundamentals. Many things that Gandhi did and said can be dispensed with without jeopardizing the essentials of his doctrine. But the kernel has to be very carefully separated from the husk in which it is encased.

DISCUSSION

Sri S. N. Thakur :—In your conclusion you come to non-violence. You say that non-violence is the ultimate answer to warfare. I also come to the same conclusion, but not *via* Gandhism. I have came to the conclusion *via* other ways.

Sri N. Mishra :—I think Gandhiji will be very happy to learn that you ultimately come to non-violence though not through his way, but through some other way.

Sri S. N. Thakur :—I come to non-violence through violence. My process is a long one. The history of Romans had been passing through that process. Let us start from the concept of Roman empire. When there would be one empire, there would be peace. For that, they experienced the achievements of the empire. Then people came to feel that there would be one religion–Christianity. Christianity came and then later on, the church became the seat of power, There was no peace. Hence, the people was constrained to view that non-violence alone is the panacea.

Sri N. Mishra :—What has happened is one thing and what *is happening is* another thing. No body will doubt that non-violence is rampant at the moment.

Prof. B. B. Chatterjee :—You have made statements in your paper that Gandhi's God was existential God. Will you elaborate this point ?

Sri N. Mishra :—Gandhi himself has said at many places that 'Satya' means existence. By this existential aspect I mean the cohesive force which binds the things of world into one.

Sri S. S. Chakravarty :—In your earlier statement, you have said that truth is God, but in the later statement you make him a hidden atheist or Nastik. How is it so ?

Sri N. Mishra :—Yes. in one sense, he is an atheist.

Dr. Ganga Dutta Jha :—Why does Gandhiji confine God to Truth alone ? There are other attributes also–goodness and beauty.

Sri N. Mishra :—His God is not a simple concept. It is a complex concept. It includes justice and love also.

Dr. Ramji Singh :—He does equate the ontological sense of God with the axiological sense. For example, he has said, "what is Satya, is also Shiva."

Dr. G. D. Jha :—What is 'Satya' is not only 'Shiva' but also 'Sundar.'

डा० रामजी सिंह :—गाँधी ने तो जोर दिया है तीनों पर। गाँधी ने जिसको 'सत्य' कहा है, उसमें 'शिव' भी आता है।

डा० गंगादत्त झा :—जब सत्य से हमारा काम चल जाय तो बाकी दो पर फिर क्यों जोर होना चाहिए ?

श्री सूरज नारायण ठाकुर :—जब तक आप पहचानते नहीं हैं तब तक सत्य अलग है, शिव अलग है और सुन्दर अलग है, लेकिन जब आप सत्य को पहचान लेंगे तो अंत में वही आपके काम आयेगा।

डा० गंगादत्त झा :—उनकी जो भाषा थी या उनका जो दर्शन था वह शास्त्रीय-चर्चा के लिये नहीं बल्कि जनता के लिये था। फिर भी सत्य' में इतना अर्थ बंद करके उन्होंने रख दिया है, जिससे कि वह समझ में नहीं आता।

डा० नर्मदेश्वर झा :—साधारण जन के लिये ' ईश्वर अल्लाह तेरे नाम'' तो उन्होंने कहा ही था।

डा० गंगादत्त झा :—जब उन्होंने ईश्वर को परिभाषा दी और ईश्वर का नया प्रत्यय लोगों के सामने रखा, तो सत्य की परिभाषा के बाद उन्हें तुरत कहना चाहिये था कि उसमें और कुछ जोड़ रहे हैं। लेकिन कहीं पर हमको ऐसा नहीं मिलता है। परिभाषा में एक ही अर्थ के साथ शब्द को जोड़ देने से हमको लगता है कि ' सत्य' शब्द पर अनुचित जोर दिया गया है।

गाँधीजी को पीछे कुछ व्यावहारिक कठिनाइयाँ हो गईं; इसलिये वे निर्गुण ब्रह्म तक आए। लेकिन सगुण ब्रह्म में विश्वास करते थे। प्रार्थना कभी भी प्रभावकारी नहीं हो सकती है जबतक कि वह सगुण ब्रह्म में केन्द्रित न हो।

श्री नित्यानन्द मिश्र :—उनके जीवन और साहित्य में कुछ बातें मिलती हैं जो यह इशारा करती हैं कि वे सगुण ब्रह्म में विश्वास करते हैं। उन्होंने यह भी कहा है— "God is a person to those who need his personal touch". इस तरह तो मालूम होता है कि वे Personal God में विश्वास करते थे। लेकिन उनके बहुत सारे अन्य वाक्य हमारे सामने हैं। इनमें उन्होंने स्पष्ट ढंग से कहा है कि मैं अब ऐसा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ कि God Person है या God Truth है, बल्कि ऐसा कहना चाहता हूँ कि Truth ही God है उन्होंने ५० साल तक जो प्रयोग किये, उनके अधीन पर है उन्होंने ऐसा कहा तो इस हालत में उनकी बातों की सार्थकता के लिये, उनकी बातों की संगति के लिये तो हमें अनुकूल निष्कर्ष निकालना ही पड़ेगा।

डा० रामजी सिंह :—जैसे शंकराचार्य के परमार्थ और व्यवहार दृष्टि में अन्तर है, गाँधी के ईश्वर-विचार में भी अन्तर है। कभी-कभी तो वे अद्वैतवादी की तरह, स्पष्ट कहते हैं कि सब माया है। "माया" शब्द का भी उन्होंने व्यवहार किया है, "लीला" का भी व्यवहार किया है। कभी-कभी तो वे बिल्कुल विशिष्टाद्वैतवादी भक्त की तरह नजर आते हैं। इसलिये शास्त्रीय-प्रत्ययों में उनको बाँध रखना बहुत मुश्किल है। डा० डी० एम० दत्त ने अपनी पुस्तक 'Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi" में कहा है कि उनका मत अद्वैत एवं विशिष्टाद्वैत से भिन्न निम्बार्क के द्वैताद्वैत के समान है। यानी द्वैत और अद्वैत दोनों सही हैं। साधारण जन के लिये तो "ईश्वर अल्लाह तेरे नाम" है ही। जो जरा पहुँचे हुए हैं उनके लिए केवल 'ब्रह्म' सत्य होगा, अद्वैत होगा। इसलिये अद्वैत और द्वैत दोनों का समन्वय हो सकता है। अन्तर केवल दृष्टिकोण का है। मूल्य का क्या मापदंड होगा जिसके द्वारा हम उचित अनुचित के बीच में भेद कर सकेंगे। जब देश और काल में मूल्य बदलता रहता है तो क्या "सत्य" भी बदलता जायगा क्योंकि "सत्य" भी तो एक मूल्य ही है।

श्री नित्यानन्द मिश्र :—नहीं। Harmoney, love और Justice सत्य के अभिन्न अंग हैं। ये चिरंतन मूल्य हैं जो बदल नहीं सकते। Love is an eternal value, justice is an eternal value.

श्री कमलेश्वर साह :—"Is it not correct to say that truth of Gandhi is not God but observance of duty."

श्री नित्यानंद मिश्र :- आप ऐसा कह सकते हैं। नैतिकता तो उसका अभिन्न अंग है, लेकिन सिर्फ नैतिकता में ही सीमित न रहें। उसके बाहर जो उसका तात्त्विक पहलू है, उसको भी शामिल कीजिए।

श्री कमलेश्वर साह :—गाँधीजी के लिये Truth ही God है। यह विचार केवल बौद्धिक स्तर पर श्रेयस् है, किन्तु व्यवहार के लायक नहीं। आज तक का इतिहास साक्षी है, गाँधीजी के विचार मात्र काव्य कल्पना (Poetic imagination) हैं।

श्री नित्यानंद मिश्र :—ऐसा कहना गलत है कि वे व्यवहार के लायक नहीं हैं। गाँधीजी ने तो कम-से-कम एक प्रयोग करके दिखला दिया है कि वे व्यवहार के लायक हैं। हाँ, अभी तक पूर्ण रूपेण उनका व्यवहार नहीं हुआ है और न हो रहा है। इतिहास इस बात को बताता है। चूंकि व्यवहार नहीं किया जा रहा है उन विचारों का, इसीलिये हम आज इस दशा में पहुँचे हुए हैं। मेरा कहना है कि जबतक उनका व्यवहार नहीं किया जायगा, तब तक इस स्थिति से हमलोग मुक्त नहीं हो सकते हैं।

श्री कमलेश्वर साह :—मार्क्सवाद जितना सफल रहा है उतना गाँधीवाद सफल नहीं हो सका है।

श्री नित्यानन्द मिश्र :—क्या आपका मतलब यह है कि असत्य, हिंसा तथा हिटलर का रास्ता अख्तियार किया जाय ?

डा० गंगादत्त झा :—उनके कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि गाँधीवाद अव्यावहारिक है। वह उतना व्यावहारिक नहीं है जितना मार्क्सवाद वगैरह है।

श्री नित्यानन्द मिश्र :—कैसे व्यावहारिक नहीं है ? उन्होंने इतना बड़ा-बड़ा काम करके दिखला दिया है, फिर भी आप कहते हैं कि व्यावहारिक नहीं है ? हाँ, आप यह कह सकते हैं कि कठिन है।

एक नेत्रविहीन छात्र :—उनके मानने वालों पर कहाँ असर पड़ा ?

श्री नित्यानन्द मिश्र :—अगर असर नहीं पड़ा तो इससे मूल मंत्र कैसे खराब समझा जा सकता है ? इसमें मानने वालों की गलती है, इसमें हमारी गलती है।

डा० गंगादत्त झा :—एक सिद्धान्त है कि फल से जड़ को जानो।

श्री नित्यानन्द मिश्र :—आप कैसे कह सकते हैं कि गाँधीजी ने जो प्रयोग किया, उसका कोई फल नहीं हुआ ?

डा० गंगादत्त झा :—उसका फल उनके जीवन में ही हुआ था। लेकिन अब हमलोग देख रहे हैं कि उनके शिष्यों पर कोई असर नहीं है।

श्री नित्यानाद मिश्र :—इसमें शिष्यों का दोष हो सकता है, हमलोगों का दोष हो सकता है। इसमें सिद्धान्त के दोषी होने का सवाल कैसे हो सकता है ?

Sri S. S. Chakravarti :—According to your views, there shall not be Utopain idea then, because all Utopain ideas are very good, but they are not practicable. No, I am to say that Gandhiji's ideas have not been practised because people are not practising it.

Sri N. Mishra :—Because people are not practising it, therefore they are impracticable. you can not say so. Suppose, you are not practising violence, is then that violence is impracticable. What would be your reply ? If violence is practicable, then non-violence also is practicable.

डा० गंगादत्त झा :—यह ठीक है कि गाँधीजी ने जो भी बातें कही हैं, वे बहुत अच्छी हैं। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि जिसमें इतनी बड़ी शक्ति है, उसका इतना जल्दी कैसे दुरुपयोग हो गया ?

Gora

GANDHI'S CONTRIBUTION TO ETHICS, PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

Gandhi was remarkably different from several prophets and philosophers. Prophets often claim eccult powers and infallibility; profess experience of visions and revelations; and perform tricks which devotees deem miracles. But Gandhi was a simple man. He claimed no super-human powers and wanted none. He said that he wore the same corruptible flesh which the weakest of his fellow-beings wore and was therefore liable to err as any (Collected Works XXII–417). Speaking about the inner voice of which much fuss was made, he said, "Every one who wills can hear the Voice. It is within everyone. But like everything else, it requires previous and definite preparation." (My Religion–46). He demurred to bear the burden of Mahatmaship and desired to be called simply 'Gandhi'. Similarly he was neither an intellectual nor a scholar to be ranked among philosophers like Shankara, Spinoza, Marx and Aurobindo. The early chapters of the *Autobiography* and the researches of J.M. Upadhayay reveal that Gandhi did not have a brilliant educational career, that he was a shy and retiring type of student at London and that he was a miserable failure as a barrister when he set up legel practice at Bombay.

How could that shy, timid dud become a man to whom Albert Einstein paid the glowing tribute, "Generations to come, it may be, will scarcely believe that such a one as this ever in flesh and blood walked upon this earth."

Gandhi's greatness lay in his commonness, While many, many persons of greater talent and better facility leapt like the hare and slept on the way, Gandhi crawled like the proverbial tortoise and reached lengths which despaired the mighty. He struggled humbly and patiently to live the simple precepts of truthfulness and fearlessness which he, like children of normal breeding, received from his mother and from an old servant of his family, Rambha.

What is that way of truth which inspired Gandhi so intensely ?

Scholars indulging in disquisitions may write volumes on the nature of truth. But to the common people truth is straight and simple. A man is truthful if he says what he does and does what he says. Gandhi was a common man and so he tried to say what he did and to

do what he said. He considered himself untruthful when he, at the age of twelve, ate meat and could not tell his mother the real reason for the loss of appetite. He was untruthful again when he stole coppers to pay for cigarettes which he smoked stealthily. To save himself from the shame and compunction of not telling what he did, he voluntarily confessed the sins to his father and thereby laid the foundations for his experiments with truth.

Gandhi's devotion to truth gave a new dimension to every aspect of life he touched, religion or politics, education or aesthetics. Truth with him was no longer a concept, but an activity, since it involved doing besides saying. A thought or word was not truthful without the related deed. Anything to be truthful had to be active. So those who followed the Gandhian way, could not remain absorbed in deep contemplation, pouring over books or delivering sermons, They had to gird up their loins and do what they said, for everyone had some thoughts to say. During Gandhi's time, most of the people bestirred themselves with activity, doing what they were saying. The whole activity was called '*Satyagraha*' which meant insistence on truth.

Consistent with the practical understanding of truth, Gandhi defined his religion as : 'You must watch my life, how I live, eat, sit, talk, behave in general. The sum total of all those in me is my religion.' His religion was not a beleif; it was an activity. Likewise, when Joan V. Bondurant approached Gandhi with a view to doing research on *Satyagraha*, he replied that *Satyagraha* was not a subject for research, it should be experienced, used and lived. Gandhi hesitated to advise anything he was not himself prepared to follow. So he took to loin-cloth himself at first at Madurai in 1921 to lead the way and to make it easy for those who could not change to simpler clothing on discarding foreign garments. Gandhi said that the way to convert atheist to belief in God was not argument but the purity and good conduct of the believers in God.

Thus the foremost contribution of Gandhi to ethics, religion and philosophy was to turn them from a set of theoretical inquiries into a set of actual deeds. Thereby he brought philosophy and religion from the closets of seers and scholars to the reach of common people.

The ingredient of action contained in Gandhi's truthfulness changed the basis of philosophy from causal materialism to conscious individualism. In order to 'do' the truth, an individual has to feel

free. As doing is essentially an act of freedom, Gandhian way is based upon the recognition of the freewill of the individual but not upon any determinism into which we get entangled, when we talk of causal logic or materialistic existence.

Of course, Gandhi frequently talked of a supreme power and of his surrender to it. But it was conventional. At later stages, when he was face to face with communal disturbances, he set aside considerations of conventional religion.

Nevertheless, he did recognise the freewill of man and encouraged the growth of self-confidence. He said, 'I am an irrepressible optimist, because I believe in myself. That sounds very arrogant, doesn't it ? But I say it from the depth of my humility.'. 'I am an optimist because I expect many things from myself.'

Faith in the freedom of man led to the faith in the goodness of man. He wrote, 'In the application of the method of non-violence, one must believe in the possibility of every person, however depraved, being reformed under skilled and human treatment.'

Also the feeling of freedom rejected suggestions of weakness or subordination of man. He rejected the word "passive resistence" because of its insufficiency and its being interpreted as a weapon of the weak. While asserting that 'fearlessness is the first requisite of spirituality and that cowards can never be moral', he proceeded to show the relation between morality and activity. "A meek submission when one is chafing under a disability or a grievance which one would gladly see removed, not only does not make for unity, but makes the weak party arid, angry and prepares him for an opportunity to explode. By allying myself with the week party, by teaching him direct, firm and harmless action, I make him strong and capable of defying the physical might. He feels braced for the struggle, regains confidence in himself and knowing that the remedy lies with himself, ceases to harbour the spirit and revenge and learns to be satisfied with the redress of the wrong he is seeking to remedy,' He gave immense importance to self-confidence. At Noakhali women came to him and deplored, 'We have lost our husbands and brothers and everybody. We have come to you for solace, for a word of consolation." Gandhi's reply was short and significant. "I have come to Bengal not to give consolation, but to give courage."

In this age when man is feeling small and insignificant in the

midst of political forces and economic factors, Gandhi made the prophetic utterance, "I have discovered that man is superior to the system he produced." Because centralised systems tended to dominate over the individual and to stifle his freedom Gandhi advocated decentralised methods of economy and politics. Hence he supported Gramraj or small autonomous basic units of administration which are federated progressively into a world union. He advocated decentralisation to the extent of calling it 'enlightened anarchy'.

In his passion for the freedom of the individual, Gandhi accepted no guru. "It is better to grope in the dark and wade through a million errors to truth than to entrust oneself to one who knows not that he knows not."

The feeling of freedom freed him from the fear of error even from making "Himalayan miscalculations." He claimed the right to err. He said, "The right to err, which means the freedom to try experiments, is the universal condition of all progress." Man is a self-governing being and self-government necessarily includes the power as much to commit errors as to set them right as often as they are made." "After all each one is a law unto himself." He told me, "It is not a mistake to commit a mistake, for no one commits a mistake knowing it to be one. But it is a mistake, not to correct the mistake after knowing it to be one. If you are afraid of committing a mistake, you are afraid of doing anything at all." It was a bold call to action. Gandhi believed that action righted wrongs. "Superstition and undesirable things go as soon as we begin to live the correct life. I concern myself not with belief, but with asking to do the right thing. As soon as they do it, their belief rights itself."

On account of supreme self-confidence and bold action, Gandhi was growing from truth to truth. *Satyagraha*, as conceived by him, was a "science in the making" and so he was ever-growing and everflowing. Old as he was in age, he had no feeling that he had ceased to grow inwardly. Therefore, his aim was not to be consistent with his previous statements on a given question, but to be consistent with truth as it presented itself to him at a given moment. The result had been that he had grown from truth to truth and there was an underlying and abiding consistency between seeming inconsistencies.

By and large, Gandhi's contribution to philosophy is to pull it out of the moorings of a dogma and claims of theoretical perfections, to make it ever-growing and ever-flowing through abiding action.

ETHICS

Bereft of practice a big mass of pure imaginations, intellectual perfections and sweet fancies filled philosophy, ethics and religion before the advent of Gandhi in modern times. As there was no insistence on practice, the wide gap between saying and doing allowed scope for the wild growth of cant and dishonesty. But when Gandhi applied the test of truth, cant was dispelled and philosophy, ethics and religion shrank to the hard core of honest principles. Persons who parade with intellectual excellences, lost respect and workers in the field gained popularity. The change involved bold rejection of the old which did not accord with present practice. Gandhi's campaign against untouchability cleared the dross which had accumulated in the name of Shastras.

Gandhi considered himself a Sanatani Hindu and believed in Vedas, Upanishads and Puranas. But he said, "This belief does not require me to accept as authentic everything that passes as Shastras. I reject everything that contradicts the fundamental principles of morality. I am not required to accept the ipse dixit or the interpretation of the Pundits." Then referring to the conference which opposed the movement for the removal of untouchability, he said, "I have been entreating the Hindus of Gujarat to give up, on rational grounds, the idea of untouchability, which in any case, is not followed in practice....I therefore request the Gujarati Hindus not to be misled by the resolution passed at the meeting held under the presidentship of the Shankaracharya."

The application of the principle of action to ethics not only heightened moralily, but gave rise to tolerance as corollary. Violence results from intolerance. There is no room for intolerance, if what is said is practised. That which is said and practised is the truth and so it should be accepted, and tolerated. If anything is not practised, it is a mere faith and no one should have quarrel with opinions. The trouble arises only when opinions which are held by faith are mistaken, for truths which are practised. But if the distinction between faith and truth is recognised, there is no room for intolerance and therefore for violence either way. So a truthful man is necessarily tolerant and non-violent.

This sense of tolerance made Gandhi human, outgrowing the limits of all sectarian distinctions. He described

geographical limits. If I have a living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India herself." Again he said, "I am not anti-English, I am not anti-any government; but I am anti-untruth, anti-humbug, and anti-injustice."

As a humanist, his zeal to relieve the poor took precedence over prayer too. He said, "If I am strong enough to turn the (spinning) wheel, and I have to make choice between counting beads and turning the wheel, I would certainly decide in favour of the wheel, making it my rosary, so long as I find poverty and starvation stalking the land. I do look forward to the time when even repeating the name of Rama will become a hindrance." Like nationalism and prayer, Gandhi subordinated art too to human welfare. He preferred watering and manuring of vegetables which gave food to growing a flower garden. He appealed, "Why can't you see the beauty of colour in vegetables ?" He discountenanced a proposal to construct his statue and protested, "I must dissent emphatically from any proposal to spend any money on preparing a statue for me, more especially at a time when people do not have enough food and clothing.....Imagine how many hungry mouths would be filled if the amount is spent on growing more food crops."

Like his compassion, Gandhi's tolerance excluded none from his concern, even beef-eaters and criminals, though he was a strict vegetarian and ascetic moralist. In South Africa he was faced with the question of treating beef-eaters. He laid down, "I had already given my support to meat-eating and beef-eating. If I made a rule that meat eaters should not be helped, I would have to prosecute the *Satyagraha* struggle through vegetarians only which was absurd as the movement had been organised on behalf of all classes of Indians. I did not take long to visualise my duty in these circumstances." About criminals he was equally clear. "In South Africa I had as my associates murderers and thieves, men who had certainly suffered imprisonment for attempts to murder or steal. Only they carried out their contract as to non-violence as honourably as any other *Satyagrahi*." He learnt from these experiences, "Imperfect ourselves, we must be tender towards others and be slow to impute motives."

Humanism was not a mere moral sentiment with Gandhi. It was a living reality. If all were human beings there should be equality among them in every respect. He did not wait for the establishment of equality through change in the social order, or through State

legislation. Though he was working for political independence of the country, he formulated the constructive programme for the immediate realisation of equality through voluntary effort of individuals, as he believed in the equality of individuals. Austerity was not a personal virtue, but a social obligation. No one was entitled to enjoy more than his fellow-men can. So he took to loin cloth. Another practice which he adopted was third class travel in trains. He started it in South Africa. "We could go by rail (to Johanesburgh) only on public business of our little commonwealth (Tolstoy Farm), and then too travel third class. Any one who wanted to go on a pleasure trip, must go on foot and carry home-made provisions with him." The practice of these austerities set ethical norms and inspired moral conduct.

As in the case of philosophy, ethics also was an activity with Gandhi. He was a realist and not a dreamer.

RELIGION

Gandhi started his life conventionlly as an orthodox Vaishnavite. Steeped in customary faith, he said, "You may pluck out my eyes, but that cannot kill me. But blast my belief in God, and I am dead." Yet, as he went on practising truth, he saw the incompatibility between faith in the orthodox form of God and harmony in social relations. So he changed the form of belief consistant with the needs of truthful living. He wrote in 1931, "I come to the conclusion that for myself God is Truth. But two years ago I went a step further and said that Truth is God." In fact it is more correct to say that Truth is God than to say that God is Truth." In 1946, when he was in the thick of communal disturbances, he became more realistic. He found that the interpretations of God were varied and that they could not be brought to a common ground, because God was a faith and not a truth. Nevertheless the faith was rooted deep in human tradition. So he tried to evolve communal harmony by combining the several Gods instead of attempting to evolve a common character. In the verse of prayer he put Iswara and Allah together. Even that did not work satisfactorily, as the faiths were conflicting. So he by-passed the issue by supporting the establishment of secular state. In the *Harijan* of 31. 8. 1947 (page 303) he was reported to have said that religion was a personal matter and if we succeded in confining it to the personal plane, all would be well with our political life. He wished the officers of the Government, as well as the members of the public, undertook

the responsibility and worked whole-heartedly for the creation of a secular state.

So long Gandhi was treating life as a whole. He said in 1922, "I claim that human mind or human society is not divided into water-tight compartments called social, political and religious. All act and react upon one another." If twenty four years later he felt the need of the formation of a secular state, separating religion from politics, it was evident that, like the rejection of certain portions of the Shastras became necessary for him for removing untouchability, it had also become neccessary to reject the idea of God at a certain stage for a seeker of truth. This stage had arrived for Gandhi in 1946. Devotion of truth exposed the falsity in the concept of God. Gandhi did not hesitated to set aside God. Truth required it, and he did it.

A more specific situation arose when Gandhi offered to celebrate marriage of my daughter, because that marriage came under the class of marriages to which he avowed himself. I, as an atheist, objected to the reference to God in any form in course of the performance of the marraiage, if Gandhi was to celebrate it. Then he agreed to say "in the name of truth" instead of "in the name of God" in course of the ceremony. This instance illustrates how he was marching only from "God is Truth" to "Truth is God" but further to 'Truth is Truth'.

The form of prayer was alse undergoing a similar change, in response to the demand of truth. The orthodox Hindu type of Bhajan was mixed with mention of the names of Gods of other religions too. Moreover the inclusion of two minutes of silence in the prayer time was without significance. After the life-time of Gandhi, Vinoba went further and made silence alone the item of the prayer and called it "maun-prarthana" or prayer in silence. Just as Gandhi tried to cultivate common ground with atheists by bringing truth to the fore-front, leaving God aside, Vinoba invited atheists to join the silent-prayer. He said that in silence one could contemplate on truth, love and compassion and necessarily on God. A new connotation was given to the old word 'prayer.' The term also could change in course of time as the needs of truth required it.

Gandhi was growing and moving from truth to truth. He never allowed old forms to hamper progress. If he felt that the progress of humanity and truth required leaving God together and taking up

atheism, I can say with confidence, because of my experience with him, he was not the man to hesitate.

Gandhi's contribution to every aspect of human life is to make it free, open and active. Every system was subordinated to man, who is the ultimate master. Philosopoies, religions and ethics should not be like printed books, neatly bound and kept in shelves for occasional reference but they should be like newspapers, used and thrown out, getting a fresh edition every-time. *Gandhi was great; but we can be greater, if we go his way.*

To make us greater than him, is his contribution to us.

DISCUSSION

Dr. K.R. Gupta:—Is there any inconsistency of norms in Gandhiji ?

Dr. K. M. Prasad :—Gandhi was changing. He was evolving, i. e. from time to time. Originally he had a definite conception changed and he said that he was consistent with truth, that appeared to him at a particular time. He was always evolving So, there is no question of any inconsistency of norms in Gandhi. Norms are also changing.

Dr. Ramji Singh :—Will the norm of 'truth' also change ?

Dr. K. M. Prasad :—Everything is changing Nothing is static.

Dr. Ramji Singh :—Then according to Prof. Gora, even Gandhi will have no locus standi.

Dr. K. M. Prasad :—Trurh is always changing. To Gandhiji truth might have appeared in a particular way, later on the same truth may appear to others in a different way ? So, there is question of perspectives also.

Dr. N. Jha :—My impression is that when Gandhi used the word 'Truth' in connection with God, he meant something unchangeable, which was attribute of God.

Dr. K. M. Prasad:—Truth, as such, may be something permanent, eternal, but as conceived by man, it changes.

डा० विश्वबन्धु चटर्जी
गाँधी विद्या स्थान, वाराणसी

गांधी-दर्शन की दृष्टि से हृदय-परिवर्त्तन

व्यक्तित्व-परिवर्तन जैसी मानसिक प्रणाली सर्वथा व्यक्तिगत (individual) प्रणाली है—एक ही व्यक्ति उस परिवर्तन का क्षेत्र है। परिवर्तन गंभीर हो सकता है, या अगंभीर, ऊपरी-ऊपरी स्तर का भी हो सकता है। धार्मिक मानस-विप्लव के जो उदाहरण साहित्य में मिलते हैं, वह एक ही व्यक्ति में सीमित न रहकर, सामूहिक भी हो सकता है, किसी-किसी विशेष परिस्थिति में। एक विशेष प्रकार के मानसिक तथा व्यक्तित्व-परिवर्तन की विधि, जो कि गाँधीवादी या गाँधी-प्रदर्शित हृदय-परिवर्तन कहा जाता है, व्यक्ति के स्तर पर तथा समूह के स्तर पर—दोनों स्तर पर ही प्रकट हो सकता है। गाँधी-दर्शन के अनुसार जो हृदय-परिवर्तन होता है, उसके कुछ मनोवैज्ञानिक पहलुओं के ऊपर संक्षेप में यहां विचार किया जा रहा है। इस प्रणाली में विशेष बात शायद यही है कि यह जनमानस के आमूल परिवर्तन में सहायक विधि हो सकती है, और साथ ही साथ यह प्रणाली शान्तिपूर्ण, तथा अहिंसा पर आधारित है।

गाँधीजी की प्रदर्शित प्रणाली मूलतः एक द्वैत-व्यक्तिक प्रणाली है—अर्थात् इस प्रणाली में दो पात्र का होना आवश्यक है—यद्यपि इस नाटक में दो से अधिक पात्र भी प्रायः शामिल होते हैं, विशेष करके जहां अन्याय तथा अविचार के विरुद्ध किसी प्रकार के प्रतिरोध और प्रतिवाद की बात है। नाटक में चाहे कितने भी पात्र हों, इस द्वन्द्वात्मक रीति में एक प्रकार की दिशाभुमुक्ति (Polarization) अवश्य पाई जाती है: एक तरफ होते हैं परिवर्तन के संचालक या प्रेरणादायक, जिसे कि गाँधीजी "सत्याग्रही" का नाम दिये हैं। और दूसरी तरफ हैं, वे पात्र, वे मनुष्य, जिनके हृदयों को पिघलाकर परिवर्तित करने का प्रस्ताव किया जा रहा है। इन सबों के हृदय को इस प्रकार से निर्मल, शोधित किया जायगा कि वे स्वयं 'सत्याग्रही" जैसे बन जायेंगे। इन घटना को संभव करने का सर्वोत्तम यंत्र जो कि सत्याग्रही के पास हैं, वह है "अहिंसा"। इस विषय पर एक लेखक श्री गोपीनाथ धवन का कहना है: "अहिंसा को जीवन की नीति स्वीकार करने का मतलब यह होता है कि व्यक्ति दूसरे के संपर्क में अहिंसक रहता है, विशेष करके अन्याय, अविचार और पाप को प्रतिरोध करने के समय। एक सत्याग्रही के अहिंसा की सही चुनौती संघर्ष के समय के तनाव में ही पायी जा सकती है। किन्तु सत्याग्रही दूसरे के अन्दर स्थित अविचार–अन्याय के साथ युद्ध करने के पूर्व, उनके अपने हृदय के अन्दर जो अविचार-अन्याय है, उस पर उसे ध्यान देना है। सत्याग्रह का आरम्भ और समाप्ति दोनों ही आलोक में अपनी दिशा को मोड़ने पर निर्भरित है। दूसरे के विरुद्ध सत्याग्रह आरम्भ करने के पूर्व वह अपने विरुद्ध होना चाहिए। इसका माने है अहिंसा मूल्यों को विचार और युक्ति के आधार पर ग्रहण

करना। यह नियमानुवर्तिता-जिसमें चिंतन और भावावेश के ऊपर नियंत्रण भी सन्निहित है,—सत्याग्रही के अन्दर आत्मशक्ति के रूप में प्रकट होता है।" (श्री गोपी नाथ धवन, "महात्मा गाँधी का राजनैतिक दर्शन", अहमदाबाद, १९५१, दूसरा संस्करण, पृः १४८-१४९ से अनुदित)।

गाँधी नीति और कर्मप्रणाली में 'हृदय-परिवर्तन' का एक विशेष स्थान है। गाँधीजी ने जिस प्रकार से इसका प्रयोग किया है, उससे स्पष्ट होता है, कि उनके सामने यह एक शक्तिशाली सर्वांगीण:और संपूर्ण वैचारिक शस्त्र था। उदाहरण स्वरूप उनके ऐतिहासिक नोआखाली अभियान में हिन्दुओं को पुनर्वासन करने के लिए प्रचेष्टा—जो लोग निहायत भयंकर भीति के कारण अपना देश छोड़कर चले गये थे—उसमें एक ही उद्देश्य था: संख्यागरिष्ठ मुसलमान संप्रदाय के हृदय का मौलिक परिवर्तन, उस सीमा तक कि संख्यालघु हिन्दू संप्रदाय उस भीति से मुक्त हो जाय, जो उनको जड़ बना दिया था। (श्री निर्मल कुमार बोच, "गांधी के साथ मेरे दिन" कलकत्ता: इंडियन ऐसोसिएटेड पबलिशिंग, १९५३, पृ० ६७-६८।

अहिंसक सत्याग्रह का मूल उद्देश्य है, प्रतिद्वन्द्वी का हृदय को पिघलाकर उसे बदल देना। प्रतिद्वन्द्वी को स्वमत में लाने को यह प्रणाली अहिंसक कार्य और मूल्य दोनों को महत्व देती है। एक सत्याग्रही यह प्रणाली को मात्र आरंभ कर देता है, अपने ही कार्य से: किन्तु प्रणाली शुरू होने के बाद अपनी समाप्ति के ओर अपनी अंतर्निहित प्रवणता और यौक्तिकता की शक्ति से ही बढ़ती है।

दूसरे के ऊपर अपनी राय बलपूर्वक स्थापित करने के प्रति गाँधीजी का कदापि समर्थन नहीं रहा। शक्ति और अधिकार के प्रयोग द्वारा जो आज्ञानुवर्तिता मिलती है, जिसमें भय भी शामिल है, उसमें स्थायित्व कम होता है। कारण उस आज्ञानुवर्तिता के अंदर उसके चूर्णविचूर्ण होने की संभावना, जो अन्य प्रकार के संघात, संघर्ष और विरोध की तरफ प्रेरित करती है, जिसके फलस्वरूप जो उद्देश्य लेकर सत्याग्रह किया गया उसीका मर्मच्छेद होता है।

गाँधी-दर्शन में मानसांतरण एक मौलिक प्रणाली है—एक शक्ति का स्रोत जिसके एक कोने में है सत्याग्रही, और दूसरे कोने में ही वह नागरिक, जिसका परिवर्तन हम चाहते हैं। यह एक प्रकार का शुद्धिकरण है। गाँधीजी की भाषा में—"सत्याग्रह धर्मान्तरण जैसी एक पद्धति है। इसमें शोधक, अपनी इच्छा गोष्ठी के ऊपर बलपूर्वक थोपने की भावना नहीं करते हैं: परन्तु वह उसके हृदय को स्पष्ट करने की चेष्टा करते हैं। बाहरी शक्ति इस प्रेमशक्ति के साथ नहीं मिलानी चाहिए।" (गांधीजी, यंग इंडिया, मई १, १९२४)।

वास्तविक तो यह है कि गाँधीजी अहिंसा और प्रेम को अभिन्न समझते थे:

"मैं मानता हूँ कि अहिंसा का वह भाष्य जो एक नकारात्मक दूसरे को हानि न पहुँचाने में ही सीमित है, वह परित्याज्य है। अहिंसा प्रेम का एक सक्रिय रूप है, जिसमें दुष्ट और दुष्कृतिकारी का भी उपकार करना शामिल है—लेकिन वह अन्याय करता ही जाय, फिर भी उसे सहायता करनी है ऐसा नहीं। परन्तु, प्रेम जो कि अहिंसा का सक्रिय रूप है, अन्याय का प्रतिरोध भी करने के लिए सर्वथा प्रस्तुत है—अन्यायकारी का वर्णन करके भी।" (गाँधी, यंग इंडिया, जनवरी, १६, १९२१)।

अहिंसा की असली प्रकृति के बारे में विस्तार करते हुए गाँधीजी का करना है।

"अहिंसा की गतिशील संज्ञा में सचेतन वेदना और कष्ट भोग भी निहित है। साथ-ही-साथ इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि अन्यायकारी के सामने किसी प्रकार का आत्मसमर्पण हो। परन्तु अत्याचारी के विरुद्ध समग्र शक्ति को लगाकर संग्राम करना की सूचित होता है।"

(गाँधी, यंग इंडया, अगस्त, ११, १९२०)।

अमरीकी लेखिका डा० जोवान बनडुरान्ट जो कि गाँधी-दर्शन के मर्मवस्तु के संथान में समर्थ हुई हैं, कहती है: "सत्याग्रह के समय का आत्मनिपीड़न, अपने लिए नहीं, परंतु जिनके लिए अपनाया जा रहा है उसीका भौतिक मानस-परिवर्त्तन के लिए है।" (जोएन बन्डुरान्ट, "हिंसा पर विजय", बम्बई, अक्सफोर्ड युनिवर्सिटी पब्लिकेशन, १९५९ पृ० २७)।

गाँधी दर्शन में हृदय परिवर्तन एक सर्वात्मक, वैप्लविक संज्ञा है। कभी-कभी यह भूमिकम्प, या आग्नेय गिरि का उद्गार के विपर्यय जैसा दूरप्रसारी किन्तु क्षणकाल में ही संघटित होती है, जिसके फलस्वरूप व्यक्ति के जीवन दर्शन में ही क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्त्तन आ जाता है. इसके पश्चात जो भी नयी-नयी स्थितियाँ पैदा होती हैं मूल तो एक ही स्थान पर निहित रहता है—वह है व्यक्ति के मानस में स्थायी नव-रचना तथा नव-संस्थापन। साथ-ही-साथ यह सब विशेषताएँ भी पायी जाती है:—

(१) परिवर्तित होने के लिए प्रेरणा और अनुरोध, व्यक्ति के विवेक के प्रति ही परिचालित किया जाता है। आकस्मिक परिवर्तन न्यानुगत और सार्वभौम नीति के आधार-शिला पर ही स्थापित हो सकता है, यह कोई तात्कालिक कामचलाऊ समझौता या व्यवस्था नहीं हो सकता है।

(२) जो भी पीड़ा, कष्ट, निग्रह या वेदना इस परिवर्तन के अनुगामी है। यह स्वयं सत्याग्रही ही अपने ऊपर लेंगे। उनके लिए यह एक प्रेम का निपीड़न होगा।

(३) इस परिवर्तन में कई स्तर होते हैं: प्रथम स्तर में स्वयं के अपर जो निग्रह और निपीड़न लिये जाते हैं, उनके उदाहरण का प्रभाव अवलोकनकारी को हृदय के अंदर

प्रवेश करता है। तत्पश्चात, उसके मूल्य बोध में परिवर्तन आता है, और शेष वह नव मूल्यबोध पारस्परिक संपर्क निर्णय को एक नया रूप देता है—पारस्परिक क्रिया-प्रक्रिया को एक नया स्तर पर लाकर समर्पित कर देता है।

गाँधीवादी हृदयपरिवर्तन और आधुनिक व्यक्तित्ववाद

गाँधी दर्शन के अन्तर्गत हृदय परिवर्तन के साथ व्यक्तित्व का परिवर्तन जो आधुनिक मनोविज्ञान का एक प्रधान विषय है, काफी सादृश्य पाया जाता है। यह सादृश्य किस सीमा तक जाता है, उसकी संक्षिप्त आलोचना यहाँ की जा रही है।

आचरणतत्व की दृष्टि से सबसे महत्वपूर्ण बात यह है कि, व्यक्तित्व में परिवर्तन आने के पश्चात सभी व्यवहार या आचरण विशेष करके जो सामाजिक आचरण हैं—यानी दूसरे व्यक्ति के साथ संबंध स्थापन कराना है, या जो उसके किसी व्यवहार के उत्तर में किया जाता है—यह सभी में एक नैष्ठिक नियमानुवर्तिता परिलक्षित होती है। इस विचार से गाँधीवादी हृदयपरिवर्तन के साथ धार्मिक हृदयपरिवर्तन का काफी सादृश्य देखा जाता है। हमारे पुराण और इतिहास में इसके कई उदाहरण मिलते हैं। बाईबिल में वर्णित सल का सेन्टपल में परिवर्तन, भारत इतिहास में सम्राट चंडाशोक के बौद्ध प्रियदर्शी अशोक में रूपान्तर, और अर्वाचीन समय के शराबी और धर्मद्रोही जगाई और माधाई का चैतन्यदेव के भक्तों में रूपान्तर, कुछ ऐसे उदाहरण हैं। आधुनिक समय में पाश्चात्य व्यसन में आसक्त बैरिस्टर सि० आर० दास का देशप्रेमी योद्धा देशबन्धु चित्तरंजन में रूपान्तर, या उत्तर पश्चिम सीमान्त के बन्दूकप्रिय उपजाति के प्रतिनिधि खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खां का बादशाह खान में परिवर्तन और भी आकर्षक उदाहरण हैं।

किन्तु मानस-रूपान्तर का आचरण-तात्विक समाधान और गाँधी-पन्थी हृदय परिवर्तन में सामंजस्य बहुत दूर तक नहीं जाता है। आचरणशास्त्र में ऐसे उदाहरण बहुत ही कम मिलेंगे जिसमें नयी शिक्षा, नया आचरण या नयी क्रिया अत्यल्प समय के अभ्यास के पश्चात ही उपलब्ध हो सकता है। साधारणतया नये अभ्यास धीरे-धीरे क्रमशः छोटे-छोटे अंशों में उपलब्ध होता है। गाँधी-पंथी हृदय परिवर्तन सहसा कम समय की सीमा में संघटित होता है। आचरणतत्व में एक विधि है—'मध्यस्थीय सर्वात्मक विस्तार" (Mediated generalization) जिसका नाम दिया गया है—जिसमें ऐसा एक केन्द्रीय आचरण उपलब्ध होता है जो और अन्य-अन्य अनुरूप आचरण भी उपलब्ध हो जाने में सहायक होता है। इसके साथ गाँधी-पंथी हृदय परिवर्तन का कुछ सादृश्य दिखाई देता है। अमूर्त शब्दों का अर्थ जिस प्रकार से उपलब्ध होता है, उसी प्रकार की यह प्रणाली है। हो सकता है कि हृदय परिवर्तन में ऐसा एक शक्तिशाली आचरण उपलब्ध हो जाता है—दूसरे का निपीड़न देखकर—जो और अन्य आचरण के ऊपर भी प्रभाव डालना आरंभ कर देता है। वास्तविक में ऐसा ही होता या नहीं, यह वैज्ञानिक शोध द्वारा प्रमाण की अपेक्षा रखता है।

और एक विशेषता है, जो गाँधी-पंथी हृदय-परिवर्तन में अवश्य पायी जाती है, वह है, चिन्तन के साथ भावावेग तथा क्रिया का समावेश। नया मूल्यबोध, नया जीवन-दर्शन, नई रोशनी में पूर्णतया निमज्जन, यह जब तक नहीं हुए हैं, तब तक कोई परिवर्तन को स्थायी हृदय-परिवर्तन से अभिदित नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस प्रकार का ऐकान्तिक निमज्जन, गीता में वर्णित तदात्मत से कुछ विभिन्न है, ऐसा प्रतीत होता है। श्री कृष्ण अर्जुन को जो "निष्काम" धर्म के बारे में अनुप्राणित कर रहे थे, उसमें भावावेग का स्थान गौण था, फल की इच्छा को मान्यता नहीं दिया गया था—किन्तु धर्म अर्थात् योक्तिकता को बहुत ही महत्व दिया गया था।

मस्तिष्क-शोधन (Brain washing) जैसी प्रणाली में एक व्यक्तित्व को सामग्रिक रूप में शक्ति के प्रयोग द्वारा बदला जाता है। इसमें जिस व्यक्ति को बदला जाता है, उसकी कुछ भी स्वाधीवता नहीं रहती है—बदलने के सिवाय और कोई रास्ता ही उसके सामने नहीं रहता है। किन्तु गाँधी-पंथी हृदय-परिवर्तन में व्यक्ति की स्वाधीनता को कुछ भी खर्च नहीं किया जाता है। परिवर्तन के अनुषंगी जो भी कष्ट, वेदना या निग्रह हैं, वह बदलनेवाला के स्थान पर बदलानेवाला ही अपने ऊपर लेता है, यानी परिवर्तन स्वैच्छिक है। परिवर्तन क्रिया में सनाक्तिकरण (identification) एवं अन्तर्मुखीनता अवश्य है, किन्तु उसे आरोप नहीं किया जाता, परन्तु उसके सृजन के सहायक स्थिति ही मात्र तैयार किया जाता है। परिवर्तन के प्रारम्भ में मानसिक विचार का प्राधान्य होता है—उसके पश्चात भावावेग का संचार हो सकता है—और सर्वशेष नये आचरण का समावेश होता है। इस शताब्दी के महान् मनोवैज्ञानिक आचार्य फ्रायड के तत्वों से इतना नहीं, किन्तु उनके अनुयायी दो-एक मनोवैज्ञानिकों के ग्रंथों से गाँधी-पंथी हृदय-परिवर्तन का अनेक सामीप्य दिखाई देता है। जैसा कि श्रीमती कारेन हर्णी और श्री एरिक फ्रम के तत्वों का नाम इस प्रसंग में योक्तिक होगा।

किन्तु फ्रायडीय मनोविश्लेषण के एक विशेष मत के साथ गाँधीय हृदय-परिवर्तन का मौलिक अन्तर है, वह यहाँ बताना आवश्यक है। गाँधीय हृदय-परिवर्तन में व्यक्ति के विवेक और नीतिबोध के सामने परिवर्तन के लिए आग्रह किया जाता है। अगर आग्रह सफल हुआ तो विवेक और भी शक्तिशाली हो जाता है। और नयी शक्ति से पूर्ण विवेक नये आचरणों को दृढ़ता के साथ नियंत्रित करना शुरू कर देता है, नये मूल्यों को कायम करता है, और नये दिग्दर्शन कराता है। किन्तु फ्रायडीय प्रणाली में विशेष करके मानसिक उत्कंठा को विदुरित करते समय, विवेक मनुष्य के अहं के ऊपर जो नियंत्रण करता है, उसीका शिथिलीकरण ही उसका मूल वस्तु है। कठोर विवेक का शासन शिथिलीकरण ही फ्रायडीय मानस परिवर्तन की आधारशिला है—जहाँ कि विवेक का शासन को सुदृढ़ करना गाँधीय प्रणाली की विशेषता है।

और भी एक प्रभेद का उल्लेख करना आवश्यक है—जो कि परिवर्तन की प्रणालियों के क्षेत्र या मानवीय आधार से संबंधित है। गाँधीय प्रयोग में एक स्वाभाविक व्यक्ति का

हृदय को परिवर्तन करने की प्रचेष्टा से वह शायद और भी संतुलित और उत्तम जीवन-दर्शन का अधिकारी हो जाता है। हो सकता है कि सत्याग्रही की दृष्टि से वह व्यक्ति दुरविभ्रष्ट माना जा सकता है, किन्तु उसे अस्वस्थ मानना आवश्यक नहीं है। परन्तु फ्रायडीय मनोविश्लेषण साधारणतया अस्वस्थ और असंतुलित व्यक्ति के ऊपर ही प्रयोग किया जाता है, जिससे वह स्वस्थ और स्वाभाविक अवस्था में आ जाय। इससे स्पष्ट है कि क्षेत्र या आधार के ऊपर किस स्तर से काम किया जाता है, उसमें काफी अन्तर है, इन दो प्रणालियों में।

शेष आधुनिक समय के मनोविज्ञान में नये आगन्तुक कुछ तत्वों के साथ गाँधीय हृदय-परिवर्तन के सामीप्य का उल्लेख करना है। श्री रजार्स के "आत्म-तत्व" (Self Theory), आब्राहम मासली के "प्राणमयवाद" (Organismic Theory) दार्शनिक जो पल् सार्तर का "अस्तित्ववाद" (Existentialism) आदि-आदि तत्वों को "नवमानवतावाद" (New Humanism) के अभिदा में लाना अनुचित नहीं है। नवमानवतावादी मतों से गाँधीय प्रणाली का विशेष नैकट्य है—और कुछ अंतर भी है। गाँधीय परिपाटी में न्याय और नीति का जो विशेष स्थान है, वह उसे व्यक्ति की सीमा पार कर जनता और समूह के क्षेत्र को विस्तृत करता है—औचित्य की मूल्यांकण-क्रिया व्यक्ति की दृष्टि से ही नहीं, समष्टि की दृष्टि से किया जाता है। किन्तु श्री कार्ल राजार्स के आत्मा-प्रतिष्ठान प्रक्रिया में (Self actualization) व्यक्ति ही प्रधान है। समष्टि का मूल्यांकण गौण है। अन्य शब्दों में रजार्स-नीति के अनुसार समाज व्यक्ति के ऊपर नहीं है—व्यक्ति अपने का अपना मूल्य स्थिर करता है—जहाँ कि गाँधी-दर्शन में वह व्यक्ति को समाज के मूल्यों के साथ सन्तुलित करता है। दोनों ही आदर्शवादी मत है—यद्यपि आदर्श के लक्ष्य बिन्दुओं में कुछ अन्तर अवश्य है—व्यक्ति से समष्टि तक।

इस समय गाँधी-दर्शन की जितनी भी आलोचना हो, उतनी ही विचार में निर्मलता आयगी, इस विश्वास से यह क्षुद्र निबन्ध प्रस्तुत किया जाता है।

DISCUSSION

Sri N. Mishra :—Do you want to adopt the view which you call the middle view ?

Dr. B. B. Chatterjee :—Yes, Sir.

Sri N. Mishra :—I would request you to tell about the middle view in a few words.

Dr. B. B. Chatterjee :—I think the man who has done most to popularise it, is Abraham Mazlo .... He has also been influenced by the Vedantic thinking. That is my own interpretation of thing.

He is acquainted with Shankra's thinking. He says that the entire behaviour of man, in order that he may be integrated is a sort of movement of the human being in a pyramidal fashion where there is a sort of herarchy or let us say a priority of motives. When the child is sucking on, he is dominated by, what is called, the self-preservation of motives. So, there is hirarchy of needs. Now when the biological needs have been fulfilled, he now moves to the stage where he needs, what is called, next stage of need, i. e. recognition need. He must be recognised by others. The third he says, that there is need for creativity. He must create something. After the biological need is fulfilled, it is recognised. Recognition needs, actually he calls, love need, needs for affection. A man also feels that he may be loved, he may also be wanted. At the fourth stage, a pyramidal structure comes, what is called the self-actualisation. That is, every man is born in certain destiny. That is, what he was made to do. He can reach that stage, i. e. self-actualisation stage only when his lower level needs are fulfilled. When you will go through these stages in a proper sequential order, then you will connect that stage with change of heart. Gandhian change of heart, I think is something like that. That is, a man is a normal man. Gandhi goes about his day today activities. Now, in order to take him to self-actualisation stage, his basic bioligical needs would be fulfilled, his affectional needs would be fulfilled, his creativity needs would be fulfilled. Gandhiji says that by means of perception of Truth, you can go to self-actualisation stage, much quicker than all other stages of Tapasya and sufferings and all that.

Dr. G. D. Jha :—I think change of heart is bound to take place, because, at one stage of human life in view individual, there is need

of self-actualisation and this self-actualisation is in one way change of heart.

Dr. B. B. Chatterjee :—Gandhian technique of change of heart may make a man very near to the self-actualisation. Ultimately what self-actualisation we attain, also would be attained by the Gandhian technique.

Dr. N. Jha :—Gandhiji used to say that non-violence was a matter of creed for him and for others, it was a policy. That means, for all the followers of Mahatma Gandhi, non-violence was just a policy which they considered to be expedient under the circumstances. That was change of heart up to the limited extent.

साध्य-साधन-विवेक

डॉ० रामजी सिंह
भागलपुर विश्वविद्यालय

१.१ साध्य उसको कहते हैं जिसको सिद्ध किया जाय और साधन वह है जिसके द्वारा साध्य सिद्ध हो। दूसरे शब्दों में किसी क्रिया के प्रयोजन या किसी प्राप्तव्य इच्छित वस्तु या उद्देश्य को साध्य और उसके प्राप्ति के उपकरण को साधन कहते हैं। इसलिये व्यापक अर्थ में साध्य एवं साधन केवल नैतिक-जगत् के ही प्रत्यय नहीं है, यद्यपि प्रस्तुत विमर्श में हमारा संदर्भ नैतिक ही रहेगा।

१.२ इन दो पदों की परिभाषा चाहे जो भी हो, यह सही है कि साध्य के बिना साधन और साधन के बिना साध्य की कल्पना अचिंतनीय है। इसका अर्थ हुआ कि साध्य और साधन सापेक्ष पद हैं जिसमें एक के बिना दूसरे को समझना असंभव जैसा है।

१.३ लेकिन साध्य और साधन के बीच यह सापेक्षता सम्बन्ध किस प्रकार का है? क्या यह **संयोग**-सम्बन्ध है, अथवा **समवाय,** अथवा **स्वरूप**-सम्बन्ध? यदि हम इसको संयोग मानें तो 'साध्य' और 'साधन' को स्वतंत्र तत्व स्वीकार करना होगा किन्तु ये दोनों तो परस्पर वियोज्य नहीं बल्कि संयोज्य पद है। फिर इन दोनों के बीच समवाय-सम्बन्ध की भी कल्पना नहीं की जा सकती क्योंकि समवाय सम्बन्ध तो परस्पर अवियोज्य होते हुए भी मूलतः एक बाह्य-सम्बन्ध है। इसीलिये यदि साध्य और साधन को कोई स्वतंत्र तत्व बाहर से जोड़ता है तो फिर साधन का साध्य पर एवं साध्य का साधन पर कोई प्रतिफल नहीं होना चाहिये। किन्तु वस्तुस्थिति इससे भिन्न है। फिर साध्य और साधन के बीच स्वरूप-संबंध की भी कल्पना कठिन है क्योंकि स्वरूप-संबंध दो संबंधित पदार्थों के बीच ऐसे सम्बन्ध को कहते हैं जो संबंधित पदों के बीच ऐक्य या तदात्मय प्रकट करें। किन्तु साध्य एवं साधन स्वरूप-वाचक पद नहीं हैं क्योंकि प्रस्तुत संदर्भ के अन्तर्गत दोनों के अर्थों में तात्विक वैभिन्न है।

१.४ किन्तु इस तार्किक भिन्नता का अर्थ यह नहीं है कि किसी वर्ग विशेष या पदार्थ विशेष को साध्य एवं दूसरे को साधन कहते हैं। वास्तव में किसी पद का साध्य या साधन होना उसके संदर्भ पर निर्भर करता है जो क्रिया या पदार्थ एक संदर्भ में साध्य हो सकता है, वह दूसरे संदर्भ में साधन भी हो सकता है। फिर एक ही वस्तु या क्रिया एक संदर्भ में साध्य एवं दूसरे संदर्भ में साधन भी बन सकता है। इसी तरह जो संदर्भ में साधन है वह दूसरे संदर्भ में साध्य भी हो सकता है।

१.५ इससे यह निष्कर्ष निकलता है कि साधन और साध्य में बाह्य-संबंध नहीं है बल्कि अंतर-सम्बन्ध है। दूसरे शब्दों में साध्य और साधन एक ही परिस्थति के दो परिवेश हैं या तत्वतः समग्र रूप से एक ही स्थिति हैं। अनुकूल परिस्थिति में किसी क्रिया विशेष को अच्छा एवं प्रतिकूल परिस्थति में बुरा साधन माना जा सकता है।

इसलिये जिस प्रकार साधन के बिना साध्य की कल्पना अवास्तविक है उसी प्रकार साध्य के बिना साधन की भी कल्पना निरर्थक है।

२.१ तार्किक दृष्टि से साध्य एवं साधन के बीच आभ्यन्तरिक संबंध की पुष्टि और भी अधिक की जा सकती है। प्रथम तो साध्य एवं साधन चूंकि निरपेक्ष पद नहीं हैं अतएव इन दोनों के बीच बाह्य संबंध की अनुकूलता कम होगी। फिर साध्य एवं साधन की अंतरंगता का यह भी प्रमाण हो सकता है कि ये दोनों प्रपर्टी टर्म्स (property terms) नहीं बल्कि संबंध-सूचक (relation terms) पद हैं। प्रोपर्टी टर्म्स (property terms) किसी दूसरे पद का गुण प्रकट करता है किन्तु संबंध-सूचक पद तो दोनों के बीच संबंध बताता है। फिर इन दोनों के बीच डायडिक (Dydic) संबंध है क्योंकि साध्य एवं साधन एक नहीं बल्कि दो विशिष्ट तत्व हैं। हाँ, इन दोनों के बीच असमान (Asymmetrical) संबंध भी है क्योंकि कोई वस्तु दूसरी वस्तु का एक ही संदर्भ एवं एक ही स्थिति में साध्य एवं साधन नहीं हो सकते। उदाहरण रूप से यदि 'क' 'ख' का साध्य है तो फिर 'ख' 'क' का साध्य नहीं हो सकते। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि उभय मुखी संबंध के अभाव के कारण हमें साध्य और साधन के स्वतंत्र महत्व को समझना आवश्यक है। फिर साध्य और साधन के बीच का सम्बन्ध नित्य एवं अपरिवर्त्तनशील (Non-transitive) है क्योंकि यदि 'क' 'ख' का साधन या साध्य है तो 'ख' 'ग' का है तो 'क' 'ग' का साधन या साध्य भी हो सकता है और नहीं भी हो सकता है। फिर दोनों के बीच यह संबंध Non-reflexive भी है जिसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि यदि 'क' 'ख' का साध्य है तो फिर 'क' अपना ही साध्य नहीं हो सकता या यदि 'क' 'ख' का साधन है तो फिर 'क' ही अपना साधन नहीं हो सकता। संक्षेप में, एक ही पद अपना साधन या साध्य नहीं हो सकते जिससे यह सिद्ध हुआ कि साध्य साधन-सम्बन्ध के लिए दो पदों का अस्तित्व नितान्त आवश्यक है। यानी साध्य एवं साधन स्वतंत्र पद होते हुए भी एक विशेष संबंध से संबंधित है।

२.२ साध्य की कल्पना के साथ प्रेरणा (motive) का घनिष्ठ संबंध है चूंकि प्रेरणा किसी कार्य के कार्यान्वयन की दिशा में एक निश्चित साध्य का संकेत करती है। ग्रीन (Prolegomena to Ethics, P. 98) ने इसीलिये प्रेरणा को साध्य की कल्पना माना है जिसको कर्त्ता प्राप्त करने का प्रयत्न करता है। डीआर्की (Short Study of Ethics, p. 90) भी साध्य की कल्पना को कार्य की प्रेरणा मात्र मानता है। मैकेंजी महोदय के अनुसार (Mannual of Ethics, p. 64) भी कार्य की प्रेरणा ही साध्य की कल्पना है। म्यूरहेड Elements of Ethics. p. 60) भी प्रेरणा को साध्य वस्तु का ज्ञान माना है जो हमें प्रेरित करता है। इसीलिये नैतिक निर्णय का विषय साध्य की कल्पना या प्रेरणायें ही हैं, जिनसे कार्य उत्पन्न होता है। बटलर एवं कोंट ने भी नैतिक निर्णय [illegible]

ही माना है बटलर का तो कहना है कि कर्म की नैतिकता का आधार उसके प्रेरक कारण का श्रेयस् अथवा अश्रेयस् होना है किन्तु कांट तो यही मानते हैं कि कर्म का शुभत्व एवं शिवत्व उसकी नैतिकता सिद्ध नहीं करता है बल्कि साधना एवं कर्म की प्रेरणाओं का श्रेयस्कर होना ही कर्म को श्रेयस्कर एवं नैतिक बनाता है। संक्षेप में हम कह सकते हैं कि बेंथम एवं मिल का विचार अत्यन्त भ्रांत है कि नैतिकता का निर्णय वाह्य परिणाम पर दिया जाय। वस्तुतः हम तो अभिसंधि (intention) पर भी नैतिकता का निर्णय नहीं छोड़ सकते क्योंकि अभिसंधि वह भावना है जो हम करना चाहते हैं या जिस फल की प्राप्ति चाहते हैं उसे वह अभिव्यक्त करती है। नैतिकता का निर्णय तो वस्तुतः प्रेरणा पर होगा जो हमसे कार्य के लिये प्रेरित करती है। इसीलिये अभिसंधि कर्म के अधिक निकट होगा जबकि प्रेरणाकर्त्ता के चरित्र एवं उसके ध्येय के पास होगा। वस्तुतः अभिसंधि कर्म का वाह्य एवं प्रेरणा इसका आभ्यन्तरिक आधार है।

२.३ हमने यह देखा कि नैतिकता का निर्णय प्रेरणा पर आधारित है और प्रेरणाकर्त्ता के चरित्र या उसके ध्येय से संबंधित है, इसलिये यह आवश्यक है कि साध्य या ध्येय की नैतिकता के विषय में कुछ विचार किया जाय। यद्यपि यह बात सही है कि इतिहास की लम्बी दौरान में नैतिकता के प्रश्न पर प्रचलित मतवैभिन्य के बावजूद भी इस बात पर प्रचलित मतवैभिन्य के बाबजूद भी इस बात पर बहुत ही कम विवाद है कि नैतिक साध्य या ध्येय क्या है?

२.४ बिल्हैमईट (The Principles of Morality and the departments of Moral life, Chap. II Moral ends) नैतिक साध्य के मुख्यतः तीन प्रकार होंगे — व्यक्तिगत (Individual), सामाजिक (social) और सार्वजनिक एवं मानवीय (Universal humanity) व्यक्तिगत साध्य की भी नैतिकता व्यक्ति की अपनी व्यक्तिगत संकीर्ण मर्यादा में नहीं रह सकती। उदाहरणस्वरूप व्यक्ति की आत्मारक्षा, आत्मसंतोष, एवं आत्म-पूर्णता तभी नैतिक होगी जब यह अपने ही लिये नहीं बल्कि सम्पूर्ण समाज के लिये साध्य स्वरूप स्वीकृति होगी। इसका अर्थ हुआ कि हमारे अपने अस्वस्थ अहम् एवं क्षुद्र स्वार्थ हमारे व्यक्तिगत जीवन के लिये भी नैतिक रूप से व्यक्तिगत साध्य भी नहीं हो सकते। लोक-कल्याण एवं लोकोन्नति का माध्यम लेकर ही हमें नैतिकता के पथ पर अग्रसर होना होगा। लेकिन यह लोक कल्याण या लोकोन्नति के ध्येय भी यदि किसी वर्ग विशेष के लिये किसी काल विशेष तक सीमित रहे तो नैतिकता का स्वर प्रखर नहीं होगा। अतः नैतिकता के लिये सर्वों के लिये सभी समय का यानी एक चिरतंन सार्वजनिक आदर्श चाहिए जिसे हम दूसरे शब्दों में सर्वोदय की भावना कह सकते हैं। नैतिकता की शुद्ध भावना व्यक्ति को उसके क्षुद्र एवं स्थूल तात्कालिक स्वार्थमूलक ध्येय को भुलाकर धीरे-धीरे समाज एवं

विश्व के अनन्त एवं चिरंतन छोर के महासमुद्र में पहुंचा देगी जहाँ सुख एवं आनन्द की प्राप्ति भी एक गौण वस्तु होकर रह जायगी। इसके सामने अंतिम ध्येय या आदर्श के रूप में नैतिक आदर्श की प्राप्ति रहेगी, भले ही उसका तात्कालिक लक्ष्य मानवता की उत्तरोत्तर पूर्णता क्यों न हो। चरम नैतिक लक्ष्य अनन्त की सीमा में ही आवद्ध है और जो हमारे सामने आदर्श रूप में ही प्रकट हो सकता है।

३.१ इस प्रकार व्यापकता एवं पूर्णता की दृष्टि से हम साध्यों के विषय में जब सोचते हैं तो उन्हें हम तात्कालिक या शाश्वत, दूरवर्त्ती या निकटवर्त्ती, वाह्य या आंतरिक में विभाजन करते हैं। साधनों का अध्ययन भी साध्य-प्राप्ति में उनकी क्षमता और अक्षमता, सार्थकता एवं निरर्थकता आदि के ही आधार पर होना चाहिये चूँकि साधन तो साध्य-प्राप्ति का मात्र उपकरण है। नैतिक दृष्टि से सोचने पर हमें यह दीखता है कि जिस प्रकार दुर्बल एवं विकृत इच्छा-शक्ति के कारण नैतिक दुर्बलता एवं नैतिक दुष्टता से समुत्पन्न हमारा साध्य भी अनैतिक बन जाता है, उसी प्रकार अस्वस्थ अहम् एवं अंध स्वार्थ से उद्भूत प्रेरणाएँ भी विकृत होकर हमारे साधनों को अनैतिक बना डालती है। इसी संदर्भ में साधन के औचित्य अथवा अनौचित्य का भी विचार आता है। मानव सभ्यता के जन्मकाल में जब मानव की नैतिक चेतना अत्यल्प परिपुष्ट रही होगी, उस समय जनमानस में साध्य एवं साधन की विभाजन रेखा ही धूमिल होगी क्योंकि साधारणत: मानव लक्ष्य की ओर अभिमुख रहता है। इसीलिये तो आज भी विकास की निम्न अवस्थाओं में विभिन्न प्राणियों और पशु-पक्षियों के बीच साध्य-साधन का विचार होता ही नहीं। साध्य-साधन का विवेक तो मानव की विवेकशीलता एवं उससे उत्पन्न विकसित नैतिक चेतना का चिह्न है।

३.२ इसीलिये साधन के साथ भी नैतिकता का प्रश्न जुड़ा हुआ है। साधन को केवल साध्य की क्षमता का निर्गुण एवं निर्जीव उपकरण मान लेना क्षुद्र एवं भ्रमित तर्क-दृष्टि तो है ही, मनोविज्ञान के जीवित सत्यों को झुठलाना भी है, साथ-साथ नीति विज्ञान के सिद्धान्तों की भी उपेक्षा करना है। इसीलिये साधन के नीतिशास्त्र तथा साधन की शुचिता या अशुचिता आदि के प्रश्न पर बहुधा दिक्भ्रम हो जाता है। कुछ लोग शायद इसी भ्रमवश कह बैठते हैं कि साधन आखिर साधन ही है, असल वस्तु तो साध्य ही है। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि साध्य के सामने साधन गौण है। इसी कारण अंत भला तो सब भला का भी सिद्धान्त निष्पन्न होता है।

३.३ स्वस्थ तार्किक दृष्टि से विचार करने पर साध्य एवं साधन अनन्य एवं अन्योन्याश्रित दीखते हैं। एक को दूसरे से पृथक् करना बुद्धि एवं विचार के साथ हिंसा है। दोनों के बीच कोई भी विभाजन रेखा या अलग करने वाली दीवाल नहीं है। यह भी सत्य है कि साधन यदि बीज हुआ तो साध्य उसका वृक्ष। इसीलिये साधन के अनुरूप साध्य की सिद्धि स्वाभाविक ही है। यह तो सत्कार्यवाद से प्रतिफलित

होगा। चाहे हम उपादान दृष्टि से विचार करें या निमित्त दृष्टि से, हम एक ही परिणाम पर पहुँचते हैं कि कारण के अनुरूप यदि कार्य है तो साधन के अनुरूप ही साध्य होगा।

३.४ इसको हम नैतिक कर्मवाद की दृष्टि से भी अध्ययन कर सकते हैं। यदि कर्म के अनुरूप फल होता है तो फिर साधन के अनुरूप भी साध्य होना ही चाहिये। इसीलिये जब साधन बीज रूप हुआ और साध्य वृक्ष रूप तो फिर बीज के अनुरूप वृक्ष होंगे हो। कर्म के अनुरूप फल, यह सृष्टि का शाश्वत एवं सनातन नियम है। ऋतं च सत्यं चाभीद्धात। इसीलिये मनु स्पष्ट कहते हैं कि अधर्म से प्राप्त समृद्धि एवं सौरभ वस्तुतः प्रकट रूप से जो भी हो, उसका अंत में समूल विनाश सुनिश्चित ही है। (अधर्मेणैधते तावत् ततो भद्राणि पश्यति, ततः सपत्ना जंयति समूलस्तु विनश्यति मनुस्मृति ४।१७४), महाभारत ने भी बताया है कि धर्म के विनाश होने से सब विनष्ट हो जाता है। (धारणात् धर्म इत्यहु धर्मेणविद्यर्थ प्रजा:—महाभारत, शांति पर्व, १०६)। मनु ने एक जगह और कहा है धर्म एवं हतोहन्ति, धर्मो रक्षति रक्षितः (मनुस्मृति ८।१५)। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि धर्मानुकूल न्यायसंगत एवं नीतिसंगत साधन का ही प्रयोग वांछनीय है।

३–५ मनोवैज्ञानिक दृष्टि से भी यदि हम विचार करें तो यह स्वीकार करना ही पड़ेगा कि न केवल साध्य का बल्कि साधन का भी मानव के जीवन और आचरण, कृतित्व और व्यक्तित्व, चरित्र एवं संस्कार पर प्रभाव पड़ता है क्योंकि साध्य और साधन एक ही मानसिक परिस्थिति के अविभाज्य अंग हैं। संस्कार का सिद्धान्त भी इस बात को की परिपुष्ट करता है क्योंकि कर्मों का संस्कार हमारे समग्र मानस पर पड़ता है। इसलिये बुद्ध ने निर्वाण प्राप्ति के लिये अष्टांगिक-मार्ग में विचार; वाणी एवं व्यवहार में सम्यक्ता पर बल दिया है। यहां तक की सम्यक् जीवन के लिये सम्यक्-आजीव का भी स्पष्ट आदेश है। इसी प्रकार अन्य लोग भी जीवन में व्यवहार के लिए नैतिक विधान बताये हैं।

३.६ नैतिकता की दृष्टि से साधन का अपना स्वाभाविक एवं आंतरिक मूल्य भी होता है (Bradly, Ethical Studies, P. 89) फिर साधन के बिना मूल्यांकन अत्यन्त अवास्तविक होगा क्योंकि साधन से पृथक् साध्यकर्त्ता की इच्छायें और अभिलाषाओं के अतिरिक्त और कुछ रह नहीं जाती (Theory of Valuation P. 89) साधन का विचार साध्य के मूल्यांकन की प्रक्रिया का एक आवश्यक अंग है क्योंकि साधन के द्वारा ही स्वयं मूल्यांकन को वास्तविकता एवं यथार्थता प्राप्त होती है। मूल्यांकन शून्य में नहीं होता, इसके लिये साध्य के साथ साधन, विचार के साथ आचार और आदर्श के साथ व्यवहार का संश्लिष्ट और गत्यात्मक परिवेश चाहिये। साध्य की वास्तविक परिभाषा की स्थापना भी साधन के उपयोग की

दृष्टि से होगी। (Mead, the, Philosophy of the Act, p. 474) यदि नैतिकता अभियंत्रण विज्ञान की तरह मानवीय विकास का महान् उपकरण है तो यह साधन की उपेक्षा कैसे कर सकता है ? किन्तु जब साधन का अध्ययन एवं मूल्यांकन होगा तो नीतिशास्त्र को वैचारिक एवं भावनात्मक आदि तत्वों के साथ अन्य शारीरिक, भौतिक, जैविक एवं विभिन्न मानसिक पहलुओं पर भी विचार करना पड़ेगा। गन्तव्य का ज्ञान चाहे हमें जितना भी स्पष्ट क्यों न हो, बिना साधन के हम वहां नहीं पहुँच सकते। इसके विपरीत यदि हम साधन को संभाल कर सकें तो हमारे लिये साध्य भी सुलभ एवं सुनिश्चित हो जायगा। इसीलिये साध्य की सार्थकता भी साधन के संदर्भ में ही है।

३-७ व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से भी साधन साध्य की अपेक्षा अधिक महत्व का ही दीखता है। सामान्य जीवन में जीवन के बड़े-बड़े ध्येय या सामाजिक आदर्शों के विषय में प्राय: काफी मतैक्य रहता है, हां उनके प्राप्ति के लिये साधनों के उपयोग का प्रश्न काफी विवादास्पद रहा है। जैसे "सभी खुशी रहें, सबों का कल्याण हो"—इस ध्येय से किसको विरोध होगा ? इसी प्रकार विश्व शांति, विश्व-बन्धुत्व एवं विश्वप्रेम की दुहाई आज कौन नहीं देते ? स्वतंत्रता, समता एवं भ्रातृत्व, सत्य, प्रेम एवं करुणा आदि मानवीय मूल्यों को कौन अस्वीकार करता है ? यहां तक कि प्रजातंत्र, समाजवाद एवं निःशस्त्रीकरण जैसे स्थूलरूप से विवाद योग्य विषय पर भी साध्य दृष्टि से आपस में अब बहुत ही कम विवाद बच गया है। लेकिन मतवाद एवं मतभेद का दुर्दान्त दुर्भाग्य तो तब दृष्टिगत होता है जब हम इन साध्यों की सिद्धि के लिये साधन-निरूपण की बात सोचते हैं या जब हम उनके कार्यान्वयन एवं आचरण के विषय में सोचते हैं। "अक्रोधेन जयेत क्रोध" हो या "क्रोधेन जयेत क्रोध" को स्वीकार किया जाय ? विश्वशांति शांति से या युद्ध से हो ? पता नहीं विवेक या उन्माद में हम कभी यह भी कह उठते हैं कि शांति के लिये युद्ध, प्रजातंत्र के लिये बुर्जुआ की तानाशाही, अनिवार्य है। इसीलिये आज साधन की समस्या प्रधान बन गयी और लगता है कि बीसवीं सदी की मानवीय सभ्यता का इतिहास साध्य की सिद्धि के लिये साधनों के उपयोग का इतिहास होगा।

४-१ इससे हम इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचते हैं कि हमारे साधन जितने ही शुद्ध होंगे ठीक उसी अनुपात में साध्य या ध्येय की ओर हमारी प्रगति होगी। "यह तरीका लम्बा, शायद बहुत लम्बा मालूम पड़ सकता है लेकिन वह वास्तव में सबसे छोटा है।" (गांधीजी अमृत बाजार पत्रिका १७-९-३३) "साध्य के सही होने पर भी अगर साधन गलत हों तो वे साध्य को बिगाड़ देंगे या उसे गलत दिशा में मोड़ देंगे।" (पं० नेहरू का कोलम्बिया विश्वविद्यालय में १७-१०-४९ को भाषण)। इतिहास हमें बताता है कि दुनिया में कोई भी शक्ति नैतिक-शक्ति की उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकती है और अगर वह कभी ऐसा करने का दुस्साहस करती है तो अपने लिये खतरे का

आमंत्रण देती है। बुरे साधन से केवल साध्य ही नहीं व्यवहारकर्त्ता भी भ्रष्ट हो जाता है, दूसरी ओर पवित्र एवं नैतिक साधनों के उपयोग से मानव का मन निष्कलुष एवं उसकी आत्मा उद्बुद्ध तथा महान् होती है। इसीलिए साध्य की सफलता हो या नहीं पवित्र साधनों का उपयोग ही अपने आप में दिव्य पुरष्कार है। इसी संदर्भ में गाँधीजी ने कहा था कि सच्ची एवं सम्पूर्ण साधना ही सम्पूर्ण सफलता या आत्यन्तिक विजय है। "Selections from Gandhiji—N. K. Bose, P. 30) अनैतिक साधनों के आधार पर प्राप्त साफल्य सच्चा नहीं क्योंकि इसमें तो हम अनैतिकता की विजय एवं नैतिकता की पराजय स्वयं स्वीकार कर लेते हैं। यानी हम "सत्यमेव जयते" एवं "यतोधर्म : ततोजय :" के सिद्धान्तों को स्वयं ही झुठलाते हैं। यह नैतिक पराजय के साथ-साथ मानव-प्रतिष्ठा के भी प्रतिकूल है लेकिन कभी-कभी तो अनैतिक साधनों का भी अच्छा परिणाम देखा जाता है, जैसे माता-पिता या शिक्षक के द्वारा बच्चों को सत्य पर लाने के लिये ताड़ना आदि। उसी प्रकार अराजकता एवं अशांति रोकने के लिये सत्य बात को भी हम नहीं कहते हैं। इस संदर्भ में हम जानते ही हैं कि नैतिकता का निर्णय कर्त्ता के अभिप्राय पर भी किया जाता है किन्तु इसका यह अर्थ नहीं हुआ कि फिर साधन का प्रश्न अर्थहीन हो गया। वास्तविकता तो यह है कि प्रकट रूप से गलत साधनों का परिणाम चाहे अच्छा भले ही दीखता हो किन्तु अन्ततोगत्वा इसमें भी काफी खतरे हैं। आधुनिक परिष्कृत शिक्षा—मनोविज्ञान माता-पिता या शिक्षा के लिये ताड़ना को मध्ययुगीन अंध-परम्परा का अवशेष प्रायः विश्वास मानता है। उसी प्रकार असत्य का एक बार सहारा लेने पर भी उस व्यक्ति पर भविष्य के लिये भी विश्वास और आस्था शेष हो जाती है जिससे संभावित हानि का हम स्वयं अन्दाज कर सकते हैं। इसी प्रकार परम धर्मात्मा युधिष्ठिर को भी अपनी क्षुद्र विजय के लिये उच्चरित धूमिल सत्य के कारण भ्रष्ट होकर स्वर्गारोहण के समय यातना भुगतनी पड़ी थी। उसी प्रकार गलत साधन के उपयोग से साध्य पर जो कुप्रभाव पड़ता है उसके साथ-साथ यह व्यक्ति को भी हीन एवं भ्रष्ट बना देता है। नैतिक विधान ही वास्तविक धर्म है।" बाह्य सुधारों से अधिक आंतरिक सुधारों की आवश्यकता है। आंतरिक दुर्दशा पर खड़ा होने वाला सुन्दर विधान भी खड़ी दीवार पर सुफेदी के समान होगा। "(कृपलानी कृत" गांधी, पृ०-८६)।

१ साधन-शुद्धि के विषय में मार्क्सवाद का भी स्थान निरूपण परमावश्यक है। मार्क्सवाद के विषय में यह मान्यता है कि उनके लिये साध्य ही साधन का औचित्य है एवं नैतिकता मात्र सुविधावाद है। यह आरोप शायद इसलिये लगाया जाता है क्योंकि मार्क्सवाद भौतिकवाद के साथ-साथ नैतिक सापेक्षतावाद को स्वीकार करता है। लेनिक मेरी विनम्र राय में इतना होते हुए भी मार्क्सवाद कम-से-कम अनिवार्यतः अनुचित साधनों के उपयोग को अपना सिद्धान्त नहीं मानता। मार्क्सवाद के अनुसार नैतिकवाद हर प्रावस्था में मनुष्य की सामाजिक व्यवस्था का परिणाम

है किन्तु इससे समान-सापेक्ष नैतिकता में "उचित" "अनुचित" की संज्ञायें खो नहीं जातीं। अपने उदात्त ध्येय की प्राप्ति के लिये न्याय, सच्चाई, दया, भ्रातृत्व, मैत्री एवं करुणा जैसे भावों को मार्क्सवाद गलत नहीं समझता। केवल इसका उपयोग समय, स्थान और अवसर के अनुकूल करने को कहता हैं ताकि मानव को स्वतंत्र, पूर्ण विकसित, एवं प्रतिष्ठित रूप से प्रगति के पथ अग्रसर किया जाय। इसीलिये मार्क्सवाद यह स्पष्ट कहता है कि ऐसा कोई शाश्वत नैतिक नियम नहीं है जो कि अपने कर्त्तव्य पालन में अपवादमय स्थिति में भी न तोड़ा जा सके। साध्य-साधन समन्वय में सिद्धि की सम्पूर्णता का विचार मार्क्सवादी नैतिकवाद का अभिन्न अंग है। वे साधनों के चुनाव में उनकी आन्तरिक अच्छाई से अधिक उनके सम्पूर्ण परिणामों का विचार अपेक्षित मानते हैं। यही अनैतिकता से बचाने की मुख्य सुरक्षा होगी। कार्य का अच्छा या बुरा होना उनके परिणामों एवं प्रेरक शक्तियों पर निर्भर करता है। नैतिक रूप से यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि अमुक रास्ता एकदम ठीक एवं अमुक बिल्कुल गलत है क्योंकि नैतिक व्यवहार कोई शुष्क एवं निर्जीव गणितीय समीकरण नहीं हैं। जीवन में हम अपने विचारों, भावनाओं, आकांक्षाओं, संस्कारों तथा अपनी परिस्थितियों के अनुसार कुछ नैतिक निर्णय करते हैं। हां इस संश्लिष्ट मार्ग में मार्क्सवाद परिणामों की सम्पूर्णता में अधिकतम कल्याण ही उसकी नैतिकबाधता मानते हुए अपनी सामाजिक जिम्मेवारी निभाता है। जहाँ तक सर्वमान्य, सार्वभौम एवं वर्ग-निरपेक्ष सच्ची मानवीय नैतिकता का प्रश्न है, मार्क्सवाद इसको इन्कार नहीं करता, यह केवल इतना ही मानता है कि यह वर्ग-विहीन समाज की स्थापना के बाद ही होगा।

४.३ रूसी विज्ञान एकादमी के विद्वान प्रो० शिशकिन मार्क्सवाद में नैतिकता का स्थान निरूपण करते हुए यह स्पष्ट कहते हैं कि मार्क्सवाद मानव के आध्यात्मिक एवं नैतिक अभ्युत्थान की कतई उपेक्षा नहीं करता। (Proceedings of Indian Philosophical Congress, p. 186) जो मार्क्सवादी आचार-शास्त्र को सुविधावाद मानते हैं सचमुच उन्हें मार्क्सवाद का भ्रान्ति-ज्ञान है। "I. P. C., p. 180 इसलिए नैतिकता की कल्पना मार्क्सवाद के लिये विशुद्ध गगन-बिहार नहीं बल्कि वैज्ञानिकता एवं कठोर वास्तविकता पर आधारित है। इसीलिए नैतिकता के नियम चाहे नित्य, निरपवाद एवं निरपेक्ष भले ही नहीं हों उनमें पर्याप्त स्थिरता होगी।" (Anti Duhring, p. 131) इसलिये तो प्रो० शिशकिन स्पष्ट कहते हैं कि जो साधन मानव को पतित करते हैं तथा जिनसे नृशंसता एवं नीचता निःसृत होती है उनके द्वारा मानवता को शोषण तथा उत्पीड़न से मुक्ति नहीं दिलायी जा सकती। इसके विपरीत मार्क्सवाद उन्हीं साधनों को अपनाता है जिनसे नैतिक चेतना परिपुष्ट होती है। (I. P. C., pp 185-186) भारतीय मार्क्सवादी विचारक श्री जोशी ने एक बार गाँधीजी को पत्र में लिखा "शायद आप सोचते

हैं कि साम्यवाद का अर्थ है" साध्य ही साधनों का प्रमाण है किन्तु वस्तुतः यह हमलोगों के विरूध एक पुराना, एवं दुष्टतापूर्ण नारा है। हम साम्यवादी वस्तुतः अत्यन्त धार्मिक एवं नैतिक वृत्ति के हैं हीं। यह बात अलग है कि हम धर्म विशेष के अनुयायी नहीं हैं।

४.४ यह स्पष्ट है कि साधन शुद्धि के विषय में मार्कसवाद का भी कोई ऐसा आग्रह नहीं है कि अशुद्ध साधन का प्रयोग हो ही। शायद हमारे बीच नैतिक भावना की उत्तरोत्तर वृद्धि का यह प्रमाण है। लेकिन किसी साधन विशेष को सर्वदा शुद्ध एवं दूसरे को अशुद्ध मान लेने में कतिपय कठिनाईयां दीखती हैं किन्तु यह साधन शुद्धि की दिशा में विकसित नैतिक चेतना का फल है। जिस प्रकार बहुत से साध्यों के विषय में सामान्य सहमति है, उसी प्रकार साधन-विज्ञान के विकास से हमें इसकी शुद्धता एवं अशुद्धता का पता चलेगा। गाँधीजी ने साधन-विज्ञान की साधना के क्रम में यह समझ लिया था कि सुकर्म एवं दुष्कर्म क्या हैं। इसके आधार पर उन्होंने मनु, प्रशस्तपाद, महाभारत आदि की तरह धर्म के लक्षण बताते हुए एकादश व्रतों की स्थापना की। पाश्चात्य जगत में भी अफलातू आदि दार्शनिकों ने प्रधान सद्गुणों की चर्चा कर साधन के विषय में निर्देश किया है। साधनों के विषय में जब इस प्रकार का व्यावहारिक दिशा-निर्देश नहीं होगा, तब साधन-शुद्धि की लक्ष्मण-रेखा सुविधावाद के अल्प प्रहार से सदा एवं सर्वदा टूटती जायगी।

५.१ साधन में अहिंसा और हिंसा के उपयोग को हीं लें। यदि हम अहिंसा की वजाय हिंसा को भी साध्य-प्राप्ति का एक साधन स्वीकार कर लें तो फिर इसमें कई कठिनाईयाँ होगी। इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है कि केवल सत्ता अपहरण के ही नाम पर नहीं बल्कि धार्मिक-सुधार एवं धर्म-प्रचार जैसे सौम्य उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति के लिये हिंसक उन्माद एवं जोश में मानवता का इतिहास रक्तरंजित हो गया। भगवान के कितने ही मंदिर एवं मसजिद तथा गिर्जे, कितनी ही प्रतिमायें खंडित की गयी एवं कितने ही निर्दोष जीवन के अंत हुए। धर्म-युद्ध के नाम पर हुई हिंसायें आज तक चल रही है। इसीलिये अपने महान् उद्देश्य की पूर्ति के लिये अदम्य उत्साह, अगाध भक्ति एवं अपरमित निष्ठा से यदि जुट जाना ठीक है तो मानवता के व्यापक कल्याण के लिए उसपर अहिंसा का अंकुश भी अत्यन्त आवश्यक है। जहां हमें अपने उद्देश्य की प्राप्ति की अनिवार्यता का अनुभव एवं उसके लिये अपेक्षित उद्विग्नता हो, वही उपयुक्त अवसर की ताक में शांत बैठे रहने का उत्कट धैर्य, असीम सहिष्णुता एवं निरन्तर आत्म-त्याग की भावना भी रहनी चाहिये।

५.२ किन साधनों से किन साध्यों की प्राप्ति होती है मार्कसवाद के लिये यह प्रश्न समाज-सापेक्ष है, इसीलिये जनहित में सामयिक रूप से मार्कसवाद क्रांतिकारी हिंसा की आज्ञा देता है जो केवल सीमित स्थितियों में सीमित समय के लिये सीमित अवस्थाओं

में सीमित ध्येय के लिये एक उपाय है। लेकिन इसके लिये कहीं अनिवार्य बाधता नहीं है, केवल संदर्भशोलबाधता है। इसीलिये क्रांतिकारी हिंसा संभाव्य हो सकती है, अनिवार्य या आवश्यक नहीं। इसीलिये तो यह व्यक्तिगत हिंसा से एकदम भिन्न है जिसमें वाक्हिंसा, आन्दोलन हिंसा एवं युद्ध हिंसायें होती हैं। इनमें केवल युद्ध-हिंसा मजबूरी के स्तर पर होती है। जो भी हो मार्क्सवाद के क्रांति-दर्शन में हिंसा का प्रवेश होता है। मार्क्स स्पष्ट कहते हैं कि "हिंसा के द्वारा ही जीर्णशीर्ण सामाजिक व्यवस्था को परिवर्त्तन कर नवीन समाज-व्यवस्था की स्थापना की जा सकती है।" Capital, P. 75 abridged.) समान अवसरों में शक्ति ही निर्णायक होती है। ' शायद हिंसा-शक्ति की संभाव्य आवश्यकता में यह विश्वास इसलिये प्रकट होते हैं कि मार्क्सवाद मनुष्य को वर्ग-संघर्ष से विकसित एक भौतिक एवं दुष्ट जोवन प्राणी मानता है और नैतिकता की सापेक्षता में विश्वास करता है।

लेकिन मानव एवं मानवीयता में विश्वास रखनेवाला कोई भी क्रांति-दर्शन मानव के आंतरिक नैतिक एवं आध्यात्मिक संभावनाओं में अविश्वास एवं अनास्था के आधार पर अंत में अपने ही अन्तर्विरोध की आग से जलकर ध्वस्त हो जाता है क्योंकि विद्वेश एवं घृणा, आतंक एवं भय, षड़यन्त्र एवं हत्या की कोख से जब रक्त रंजित पाशविक-शक्ति का प्रादुर्भाव होता है तो उससे न केवल पराजितों का पराभव एवं वंश-उच्छेद होता है, बल्कि विद्वेष की अग्नि विजित वर्गों को विभाजित कर प्रतिहिंसा के कारण प्रतिक्रांति का पथ प्रशस्त करती है एवं प्रतिक्रांति का यह चक्र शायद ही कभी अंत होता है। अत: हिंसा की क्षणिक दिव्य सफलता से अभिभूत होना गलत है। इतिहास इस तथ्य का साक्षी है कि हिंसक उथल-पुथल एवं हिंसक क्रांति से व्यक्तिगत-स्वतंत्रा का विस्तार तो नहीं ही हुआ बल्कि किसी सत्ता से उन्मत्त अधिनायकवादी के हाथों में इसका ह्रास ही हुआ है। वस्तुतः हिंसक-क्रांतियां चिरकाल से दबी हुई आशायें एवं आकांक्षाओं के ही परिणाम होते हैं, इसीलिये हिंसक क्रांति जब समाज में प्रारम्भ होती है तो स्वाभाविक ही उससे घृणा एवं प्रतिहिंसा की भावना आप्लायित होती है जहां मित्र और शत्रु, दोषी या निर्दोष का भेद ही उठ जाता है। ऐसी स्थिति में सत्ता पेशेवर राजनैतिक एवं हिंसक लुटेरे एवं पिंडारियों के हाथों में आती है जो सबसे पहले आदर्शवादियों एवं एकांतदर्शी समाज सुधारकों को ही अपने पथ से दूर कर अनैतिक आचरणों एवं भ्रष्ट मूल्यों को अपने स्वार्थ सिद्धि के लिये स्थापित करता है। जहां उचित या अनुचित का भेद त्याग कर अपने दल को सत्तारूढ़ करने के लिये आदर्शों की जलांजलि दी जाती है, गृहयुद्ध को धर्मयुद्ध कहा जाता है। इसीलिये संभाव्य या अपवादात्मक हिंसा से मानवीय स्वतंत्रता एवं संस्कृति के महल को निरापद नहीं रक्खा जा सकता। हिंसा की नशा का एकवार लत जाने से फिर वह शायद ही त्राण देती है।

इसलिये मानवीय-क्रांति के लिपे मानव की अन्तर्निहित साधुता में विश्वास रख कर

मानवीय विवेक और पारस्परिक भ्रातृत्व के उपर पर आस्था रखनी ही होगी। हमें यह विनम्रता से स्वीकार करना होगा कि केवल हम सत्य ही के ठीकेदार नहीं, इससे सहिष्णुता स्वतः फलित होगी। हमें यह समझना होगा हम भाई-भाई की तरह रह सकते हैं। इसके बिना मानवता अपने आपमें विश्वास खो देगी। इसलिये अहिंसा को साधन के रूप में स्वीकार करना अपेक्षित होगा। अहिंसा, सत्य, निस्वार्थ भावना, आत्मसंयम जैसे मूल्य मानवीय प्रतिष्ठा के ही अनुकूल हैं। अतः इन्हें नैतिक साधनों के रूप को स्वीकार करना चाहिए।

DISCUSSION (चर्चा)

प्रो० दिवाकर पाठक :—आपने साध्य-साधन को किससे identify किया है? क्या आप साधन को intention के रूप में स्वीकार करते हैं या motive के रूप में स्वीकार करते हैं? कभी आप इस संदर्भ में प्रयोजन की बात करते हैं और कभी प्रेरणा की बात करते हैं, लेकिन नीति शास्त्र में ये दोनों तत्त्व अलग-अलग माने जाते हैं। Motive के लिये हमलोग प्रेरणा का प्रयोग करते हैं और Intention के लिये हमलोग प्रयोजन का प्रयोग करते हैं, लेकिन आपने दोनों को स्पष्ट नहीं किया है। नीति-शास्त्र के context में तो हमलोग जानते हैं कि नीति-शास्त्र में जो standard हैं, वे दो रूप में प्रयोग में आते हैं—कभी-कभी हम उन्हें absolute कहते हैं, कभी-कभी हम उन्हें relative कहते हैं। मैं जानना चाहूँगा कि आपने किस context में इसका प्रयोग किया है? आप relative के context में उसका प्रयोग कर रहे हैं या absolute के context में प्रयोग कर रहे हैं? व्यावहारिक जीवन में कर्म के अनुरूप फल के होने में हमलोग युनिवर्सलिटी नहीं पाते हैं।

साध्य-साधन में जो आपने संबंध स्थापित किया है, उसको दो-चार पंक्तियों में स्पष्ट रूप से वर्णन कर दें जिससे भाषा-विश्लेषण की दृष्टि से भी समस्या का समाधान हो जाय।

डा० रामजी सिंह :—भाषा-विश्लेषण मेरे लिये साधन है साध्य नहीं। भाषा विश्लेषण की शैली मैंने इसलिये अपनाई है कि विचार विश्लेषण में अधिक स्पष्टता हो। इसके अतिरिक्त और मेरा कोई लक्ष्य नहीं है।

साध्य और साधन टोटल सिचुएशन के अंग हैं, मैंने यह कहा है। ये दोनों सापेक्षपद हैं, इसलिये इसको अलग नहीं किया जा सकता है।

आप उनका दूसरा प्रश्न सर्वोदय भावना के सिलसिले में है। मेरा अर्थ यही है, लेकिन आप चाहें तो दूसरा अर्थ कर सकते हैं। सबों ने Human values को माना है, तो मेरे भी कुछ values है। उन्हीं values को मैंने सर्वोदय मान लिया है। अगर यह आपको पसन्द नहीं है तो इससे फर्क नहीं पड़ता है। साधन और साध्य के बीच कार्य और

कारण का सम्बन्ध है। एक कारण है तो दूसरा कार्य होगा ही। इसीलिये वह बिल्कुल तार्किक दृष्टिकोण है। साध्य और साधन के बीच संबंध हैं। इसका प्रमाण मैंने लॉजिक के दृष्टिकोण से किया, साइकोलोजी के दृष्टिकोण से किया और लॉ आफ कर्म के दृष्टिकोण से किया और एथिक्स के दृष्टिकोण से किया। तो अगर आप कर्मवाद के सिद्धान्त को नहीं मानते हैं तो मेरे उत्तर देने का प्रश्न नहीं उठता है।

श्री दिवाकर पाठक :—लॉ आफ कर्म बड़ा मिसलीडिंग नोशन है। यह बड़ा ही लन नोशन मेरे मस्तिष्क में उत्पन्न करता है। इसीलिये नेचुरल साइंस वालों ने इस धारणा को जल्द-से-जल्द खत्म करने का प्रयास किया है, लेकिन धारणा खत्म इसलिये नहीं हो रही है कि इससे कुछ समस्या का समाधान निकलता है।

डा० रामजी सिंह :—मान लीजिये कि आप सत्कार्यवाद में विश्वास नहीं करते तो आपके लिये मेरा आरगुमेंट लागू नहीं होगा। लेकिन मान लीजिये कि आप कर्मवाद के सिद्धान्त को मानते हैं, यहाँ पर कर्मवाद के सिद्धान्त को माननेवाले बहुत व्यक्ति , उनके लिये वही लागू होगा।

डा० नर्मदेश्वर झा :—In the present times people generally stify the means. Even social and political sciences accept, e use of this principle, i. e. the ends justifies the means. r. Singh is against that principle. Means are ends, that is the andhian principle. He has just shown that ends and means are such -relates, that they are the same. He has tried to prove his thesis by ing arguments of all kinds. He has the usual Karma Theory, that arma is followed by a result. But I think the basic issue is, are the ds and means the same ? Whether we can completely do away with nsiderations of the rightfulness or wrongfulness of means, whether u we can justify all kinds of actions in pursuit of a good end ? These e many questions. I think the Seminar will accept these major iestions, whether in pursuit of any good end, one can completely be imindful of the rightfulness or wrongfulness of the means ? You may y that in order to achieve a good result you can do, whatever you ease. But sometimes it happens that you can make use of a bad eans and still come to a good result, now will the result justify the eans ? At the moment we feel that the Russian Revolution has been ccess. Russia has advanced materially and industrially and is a very ong power of the world. Does this justifies all that happend in issia ? You see, if you say that this is the thing which we wanted

to achieve, then all the things which have been done before, will be justified. I think, this is the question which should be asked and answered.

श्री केदारनाथ तिवारी :—जब साध्य और साधन सापेक्ष पद हैं, तो फिर उन्हें यह कहने का क्या आधार होता है कि किसी भी पूरे साधन द्वारा प्राप्त किया हुआ अच्छा साध्य भी खराब हो जाता है, क्योंकि साध्य को बिना सामने रखे हुए, अच्छा का विश्लेषण करना ही गलत है।

डा० रामजी सिंह :—साधन और साध्य सापेक्ष पद होने के बावजूद भी दोनों उस माने में अलग-अलग हैं कि दोनों का import अलग है, दोनों का impact अलग है। मेरे कहने का मतलब इसमें इतना ही था कि सापेक्षता साधन और साध्य का है। आपने कहा था कि जबतक हम साध्य को सामने नहीं रख लेंगे तो साधन का विश्लेषण गलत होगा, तो मैंने कहीं इस पर dispute नहीं किया है कि हम साध्य खराब रखेंगे। मैंने केवल इतना ही कहा है कि यदि हमारा साधन गलत होगा तो उसका effect हमारे साध्य पर पड़ जायगा।

श्री नित्यानंद मिश्र :—ठीक है। मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसा कहा जाय कि अमुक-अमुक भी हमारे साध्य हो सकते हैं। वे अच्छे साध्य हैं और चूंकि acts ही उसको पैदा कर सकता है, इसलिये acts अच्छा साधन हुआ। जिसको हमलोग साधारण ढंग से बुरा कहते हैं, यह उनको बतलाना पड़ेगा तो उससे उस अच्छे साध्य की प्राप्ति नहीं हो सकती हैं।

डा० रामजी सिंह :—इस संबंध में मेरा यह कहना है कि जो बड़े-बड़े साध्य हैं, उसमें करीब-करीब बहुत हद तक मतैक्य (General Agreement) है। विवाद और प्रश्न जो हैं वह साधन के बारे में हैं।

श्री नित्यानंद मिश्र :—Then you will have to say that thruogh bad means, good ideals cannot be achieved. But how do you know that this is a good ideal ?

डा० रामजी सिंह :—इसके बारे में मैंने थोड़ा सा संकेत दिया है, जैसे प्लेटो के मौलिक सद्गुण (cardinal virtues), हर धर्मवालों के व्रत एवं निष्ठायें एवं नैतिक गुण। इसमें मैंने मार्क्स का भी एग्रीमेंट बतलाया है कि इसमें वे लोग भी मतभेद नहीं करते हैं जैसे करुणा, दया, इत्यादि नैतिक गुणों एवं जीवन के साध्यों को वे भी मानते ही हैं।

डा० गंगादत्त झा :—क्या कभी-कभी बुरे साधनों के उपयोग से भी अच्छे साध्य की प्राप्ति होती हैं ?

डा० रामजी सिंह :—हाँ जैसे मान लीजिए कि आपके महल्ले में कोई बहुत बदमाश लड़का है कि सबलोग उससे तंग बने हुए हैं। अगर आप उसको पीटते हैं और वह उसके बाद संभल जाता है तो आपका पीटना उसके लिये और सबों के लिये अच्छा हुआ।

डा० नर्मदेश्वर झा :—राज्य सरकार शासन के संचालन में कभी-कभी जनता पर सख्ती करती ही है।

Janki Prasad Singh,
Teacher's Training College,
Bhagalpur.

THE GANDHIAN SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

Once Gandhiji was in London. A Press correspondent went to Mr. G. B. Shaw and asked him to give him some comments on Gandhi. Mr. Shaw retorted, Why do you bother for my remarks about Mr. Gandhi ? Nobody is interested in what others say about Gandhi. Everybody is interested in what Gandhi says about himself, so better go to Gandhi." I also feel that I should request this house to go to the original works of Gandhi for his philosophy and practice of education rather than listen to this small essay having some fragments from here, there and everywhere. A couplet in Urdu runs thus;

"मजा जब था कि उनके मुँह से सुनते दासताँ उनका,
कहाँ से लाएगा कासिद जबां उनकी, बयां उनका।"

However, I should like to begin by saying that Gandhi is an idealist plus a pragmatist divided by two. He gets up at 4 O'clock in the morning and says prayers to God :

इशावास्यमिदं सर्वं यत्किच जगत्यांजगत्
तेन त्यक्तेन भुंजीथाः मा गृध कस्यस्विध्दनम्।

This is idealism. The moment there is day-break, he begins spinning on his spinning wheel to prepare cloth for himself. This is simple, unadulterated pragmatism. He defines education as the drawing out of the best in man—Physical, mental and moral. Vivekanand had said that education is the manifestation of perfection already in man. Pestalozzi has also said that education is the harmonious development of body, mind and soul. Gandhijee's actual philosophy is manifested in his eleven Vratas—'अहिंसा सत्यमस्तेय ब्रह्मचर्यं असंग्रहः शरीरश्रम अस्वाद सर्वत्रभय। वर्जन। सर्वधर्मसमानत्व स्वदेशीस्पर्श भावना। ही एकादश सेवावी नम्रत्वे व्रत निश्चये।' It seems that he simply reiterates the ten commandments of Manu in his Sloka—

'धृतिः क्षमा दमोऽस्तेय शौचमिन्द्रिय निग्रहः।
धीर्विद्या सत्यमक्रोधो दशकं धर्मं लक्षणम्॥'

Gandhi's credit lies in re-interpretings Manu's ten commandments in terms of modern conditions.

Through education, he wants to create a man of the type of the 'Vaishnava Jan' of the Gujarati Poet Narsi Mehta or 'स्थित-प्रज्ञ' of the Geeta. The aim of his educational Philosophy is to create such a man livings in a Sarvodaya world. Philosophy is prescriptive and normative, education is executive and creative. What philosophy conceives and prescribes, education tries to achieve through the help of psycology. Gandhiji wants to bring about Sarvodaya through his Basic Education.

Gandhijee's concept of basic education is not random growth of a day. Like a social scientist he studied his environment in the South Africa and India and tried his new edudation in his own family and then in his own *ashram*. His conviction became stronger with his experiment at Sabarmati and when he found it useful he tried to propagate it from Sebagram. His has been a really scientific outlook in life. He believed that a sense of finality is suicidal in the scientific persuits. Even in his political fights against the British Govt. he halted, broke fasts, turned right or left when he felt that he had made mistakes. Life is changing. Education which is meant for life should also keep changing according to time and space. It is no wonder that Gandhi might have indicated a change in the course of basic education if he mere alive and new problems might have confronted him.

Gandhi's basic education combine the desciplinary conception of Locke; paedo centricism of Rousseau; work-knowledge juxtaposition of Pestalozzi; creative play way of Froebel and pragmatist educational experiments of Dewey. Thus it may be said that he is an eclectic educational system chosing the best out of everything, but this choice is entirely accidental. Gandhijee possibly had never studied the western educationists before he propounded his basic education. It is just because great men think alike. There are four main principles of basic education, (i) it should be universal and compulsory, (ii) it should be imparted through the mother tongue, (iii) it should be given in and around and through a craft suited to the environment of the child, (iv) it should be self-supporting as far as practicable.

Work and knowledge are inseparable. Work precedes knowledge. Human race has also learnt through the activities of life. Newton propounded the theory of gravitation while he was watching an apple falling on the ground. James Watt discovered the power of steam while preparing Coffee. In this way we find that human necessi-

ties generate new knowledge based on new situations. John Dewey claims on the basis of his experiments conducted in the laboratory school at Chicago. That much chemistry, geometry, mathematics, geography, history can be taught in and round and through the Kitchen, carpentary, smithy, spinning and weaving. He has also remarked that during the post industrial revolution period children in schools have had less opportunities of seeing things at work, they got timed food on the table, tailored clothes in the ready-made shops and so on. Before this revolution the children had the opportunity to watch the different processes of food and cloth production in the society. Lack of such opportunities has lessened the motivation of children for learning. So craft-based, or work-based, or activity-based, or life-based education is natural, is in direct response to the child-felt needs or wants, and is, therefore, psychological and permanent. It requires no burdening, no imposition. It does not require any artificial incentive or motivation and, therefore, it seldom creates mental dysentery.

The project method of teaching is based on this concept of Dewey. It insists that the project must be child-felt, child-enunciated, child-executed and child-assessed. Basic education tries to impart education in life, through life and throughout life. It acts as an antidote against early over specialisation in the schools and in the universities.

We shall be able to appreciate the fundamentals of basic education if we try to understand this background against which it was born. Macaulay's system of education aimed at producing bilingually interpreting clerks for the offices. It was divorced from the real life; it was bookish and formal. It was examination-ridden. Of the three dimensions in education—body, mind and soul, it aimed at the development of the mind only through memorization and accumulation of paper-degrees from the English universities which worked as the 'open-sesame' of all Govt. jobs.

With all the royal patronage of 150 years of British Rule English could not go even skin-deep in the life of the nation. It hardly touched one percent of the population. Education through the medium of English was a tyranny perpetuated to cripple the talents of the young learners. They had the dual difficulty of comprehension of a foreign language and also of the facts. Nowhere in the world was the early education given through the medium of a foreign language.

So was mother tongue made the medium of instruction in basic schools. In the past, India was rich because of her cottage industries. With the death-knell of the cottage industries in India, many allied and sister industries were also paralysed leading to the growing poverty of our country. Gandhijee wanted to revive the dying Indian economy through revitalization of these cottage industries. He had another difficulty to face. The population had been divided between two classes—the one which knew, the other which worked. The knowing group did not work and the working group did not know. This रुण्ड-मुण्ड' or 'राहु-केतु' division of our social order was a great stumbling block before Gandhi. People, who worked with their hands, were looked down upon. So Gandhi's aim was not only to encourage people to work with their own hands and develop a sense of self-respect but he also wanted to encourage people to love their work. This could not be done without touching the population at its fountain source, without catching the population young.

Education through crafts has been acclaimed throughout the world by eminent educationists. Gandhijee wanted crafts to bear fruits, he wanted schools to be self-supporting as far as possible; he wanted creative, purposive, meaningful and paying productions through crafts. The Russians want to produce educated labourers. Gandhi also aimed at some such thing; he wanted the education of the hand and the head to go together. This financial aspect of self-supporting education has been very adversely commented upon, Here also we must try to understand the back-ground against which self-supporting nature of basic education has been insisted upon,

It has been said by an education commission that India is too poor to purchase education and too iliiterate to be rich. The two dragons of poverty and illiteracy are so inextricably inter-twined with each other that it is difficult to extricate and kill them. John Seargent, an educational adviser to the Govt. of India prepared a post war educational reconstruction scheme, usually known as the Seargent Scheme. It was such an expensive scheme that if it were implemented and if the Govt. of India could afford to neglect all other items of national expenditure, even food and clothing and defence included, it could be successful in twenty years. There is a proverb in our countryside—'न राधा को नौ मन तेल होगा, न राधा नाचेगी ।' When Gandhijee insisted on the self-supporting aspect of basic education, he had this appalling truth at the back of his mind,

Gandhian system of basic education could not be given a fair trial in the field. It was born in an Ashram (आश्रम), it was tried and worked in Jashrams (जाश्रम) through a batch of mercineries, half trained, quarter-trained, self-trained and no trained—supervised, inspected and directcd by persons or officers who had no faith in the system and who wanted to abbort it as early as possible. The incurable and chronic jealousy between the traditional school teachers and the neo-mediocres of the basic schools ate into the very vitals of basic education. When money, allotments, hasty and frequent transfers, appathy for crafts and bad supervision came in, the basic education of Gandhi's dream went out. It would be wrong to say that there is an inherent weekness in the concept of basic education. Buddhism and Christianity are two good religions of the world. A Buddhist from Japan exploded the 'Prince of Wales' and the 'Repulse'—the two invulnerable British warships near the Singapore waters; a disciple of Christ far from showing to the other Cheek to be slapped, atom-bombed Hiroshima out of existence.

Now a question arises as to whether Christianity is bad. Is Christ's sermon wrong ? Is Buddhistic Philosophy of non-violence worthless ? The answer is 'No'. Similarly basic education, as was propounded by Gandhi, is not bad in itself. Its workers have made it what it is to-day. Gandhi's basic education is just the panacea of present ills in our educational system,

The hiatus between life and education, the sense of utter frustration among the youth and the resultant indiscipline among them, the over insistence on a Goddess materialistic life, the toppling of the old Indian values of life, the attempt to centralise wealth and power in the hands of an oligarchy, the nationalisation of all walks of life—these are some of the problems that can be solved by implementing basic education system which evisages to create a Sarvodaya social order of persons who are genuinely interested in living and telling line in a co-operative and creative atmosphere.

DISCUSSION

Dr. K. R. Gupta:—Is there any way at present that one can bring back the faith of work in the education, in the minds of millions of teachers? I think it is a losing concern, or it has already lost.

Sri J. P, Singh :—You mean to say that it is losing concern, it is time concern and it has already been lost and I think that is is already there in other shapes. Your universities are insisting that there should be an extension of social service in the universities and colleges. Are not all the Elementary Schools in Bihar have got in prayer, teaching-garden, spinning and weaving etc.? The fact is that the Syllabus has been changed by the Government and by the people. No adequate position for such things has been given to those schools. So I say, from 435 schools, it is now going on in 25 thousand schools So I say that it has not died down.

डा० नर्मदेश्वर झा :—हमलोगों को चाहिये कि जो शिक्षा योजना है, उसके बारे में स्पष्ट हो जायं। गाँजीजी की शिक्षा योजना यह नहीं थी कि शिक्षा के सिलेबस में हम कोई श्रम डाल दें। उनकी योजना तो यह थी कि श्रम के माध्यम से शिक्षा हो। यदि आज के पाठ्यक्रम में श्रम का कुछ अंश नहीं रहता है, चाहे वह कॉलेज का हो या वह स्कूल का हो, तो वह वर्धा योजना नहीं होगी। वर्धा योजना तो यह है कि श्रम का ही माध्यम हो। उसके इर्द-गिर्द शिक्षा-संबंधी जो बातें हैं, उनको हम सजाते हैं। इसलिये पहले इसको स्पष्ट कीजिये कि क्या ऐसो शिक्षा संभव है? यदि संभव है तो किस स्तर तक संभव है? वह युनिवर्सिटी लेवल तक संभव है या वह सेकेन्डरी स्तर तक संभव है या वह प्राइमरी स्तर तक संभव है? हमलोग इस पर व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से विचार करें कि आज के समाज में हमको डाक्टर चाहिये, इकोनोमिस्ट्स चाहिये, जो समाज के अन्दर भांति-भांति के कौशल चाहते हैं, मोडर्न सोसाइटी के लिये, वे सारे हम अपने नयी पीढ़ी के अंदर पैदा करेंगे, तो हमारी शिक्षा-योजना में श्रम के जरिये कहाँ तक शिक्षा चलाई जा सकेगी और कहाँ तक उसका सार्वत्रिकरण कर सकेंगे? कुछ खास स्कूल हैं वहाँ हमारी वर्धा योजना वाली शिक्षा चलती थी बाकी कन्वेन्शनल स्कूल्स हैं जहाँ कन्वेन्शनल ढंग की जो सामान्य पढ़ाई थी वह चलती थी और इस तरह से देश का काम चलता रहा। लेकिन यदि हम उसको सार्वत्रिक बना दें चारों तरफ वैसी ही शिक्षा चले तब तो उसका बड़ा भारी प्रभाव देश पर पड़ने वाला है।

श्री जानकी प्रसाद सिंह :—इंगलैंड में भी बच्चे सब स्कूलों में काम करते हैं। वहां मुर्गीखाना से बच्चे गंदी चीजें निकालते हैं, साफ करते हैं, मुर्गी के अंडे को जमा करते हैं, खाना बनाते हैं और खिलाते हैं। बच्चे और बच्चियां सब ऐसा करते हैं। रूस में भी ऐसी शिक्षा है। सबों ने कहा है कि श्रम लाना चाहिए। लार्ड ने कहा है—

"A gentleman must learn a trade." फ्रांस की जब लड़ाई हुई थी ग्रौर बहुत बच्चे यतीम हो गये थे तो स्मर्शों ने उनके साथ काम करके बतलाया कि काम के जरिये जो तालीम होती है, वह अच्छी होती है। रूसो ने भी कहा—"Every one must learn a trade." डिवी की करोब-करीब सारी बातें गाँधीजी से मिलती-जुलती रही हैं। डेवी ने क्राफ्टस (crafts) से कहीं भी शिक्षा का संबंध विच्छेद करके नहीं कहा है। इसलिये हमलोग यह मान लें कि दुनियां में उद्योग के द्वारा और उद्योग के इर्द-गिर्द ग्रथवा उद्योग और संसार, जिस तरह का नेचर जहां-जहां है, ऐसा हो रहा है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि यह शिक्षा जो नीचे स्कूलों में है, खासकर एलिमेंटरी सेक्शन की, उसमें क्राफ्ट के जरिये बहुत कुछ हो सकता है और होना चाहिए भी। अगर दिलचस्पी से कराया जाय तो बच्चों को अच्छा भी लगता है। जहाँ तक ऊपर की शिक्षा का प्रश्न है, इसमें भी मान्यता का प्रश्न है। एग्रीकल्चरल के एक डाक्टर ग्रमेरिका से पटना ट्रेनिंग कालेज में आये थे। वे पटना कालिजिएट स्कूल की सभा में आए थे। उन्होंने हमलोगों से एक सवाल पूछा कि "Mr. so and so, How many Agricultural Schools are in Bihar? लोगों ने कहा कि There is no Agricultural school in Bihar. We have only one Agricultural College, which is at Sabour. He asked, "What is the population of Bihar"? People said, so and so. He asked, "What is the percentage of population depending on agriculture?" People said, "70 per cent". He said "horrible, here lies the crux of whole problem. Seventy per cent population is engaged in agriculture and you have only one agricultural college? Here lies the weakness. You eat wheat but you do not yield wheat. An agriculture graduate must know agriculture through agriculture. A Sugarcane Industry is in Bihar, in Pusa. You must take training and specialisation in Sugarcane Industries."

Dr. Ramji Singh :—What about Medieal education?

Sri J. P. Sinha :—A medical graduate is equal to zero or less than zero, if he is not a House Surgeon there for a year. If you want that professional teaching and development teaching should be done, it is possible even at University level, in a limited sense. If you make a survey of the villages, have the economic survey of the villages try to know their weaknesses, try to know what are the factors which are responsible, rather than read books. If we have the first hand information we will be a better economist. The more you base your teaching of education, on complete social facts and status, the more it will be useful.

Dr. N. Jha :—This is essential.

Dr. J. P. Singh :—In their early
allowed to create something with their har
would be useful. So, not an anthology of
concerns and touches life, of our society, s
introduced that world and Gandhiji also s
choosen suited to the environment of the p
need not go for agriculture, to Agricultu
in Tisco and should have practical knowle
has to work. Therefore, everywhere in th
and theoretical knowledge should go side
through it is little understood, less practis
We should always try to maintain a scie
example, we want basic education to be
tolerate the present type of basic sch
thorough change. They must be craft-cen

By Prof. S. S. Chakrabarty
Marwari College, Bhagalpur

NON-VIOLENCE AND THE MODERN WORLD: SOME QUESTIONS AND AN APPEAL

The modern world seems to be deluged with violence. Wherever we cast our eyes, we find a naked dance of violence and destruction. In Vietnam we find hundreds of people being killed daily in the most inhuman and shocking manner. In West Asia whole armics were done to death in a few hours. Nearer home we find violent mobs recklessly destroying public and private property at the slightest provocation. On the other hand we see a powerful and enraged government unleashing leonine violence on an unarmed and helpless populace. Violence, it seems, reigns supreme everywhere and the forces of peace and non-violence seem to be on the wane.

Yet it is admitted by everybody that violence does not solve any problem. In fact, it creates more problems than it tries to solve. The world passed through two blood-baths ostensibly to put an end to all wars. Yet we find that instead of ending wars, it has brought forth a crop of small wars which are gradually pushing the world to a third holocaust. The violent suppression of Negroes in U S. A., the Nagas in India, the Tibetans in China, and the Communists in Indonesia, is only giving rise to more and greater violence everywhere.

That being the situation, everybody would be happy if the problems of the world could be solved through non-violence. Non-violence is so desirable and violence is so repulsive that even a section of the Communists say that they would prefer a non-violent road to socialism provided their opponents did not force violence upon them. Who would not be happy if the Vietnam problem, the West Asian crisis, the inequalities between the haves and the have-nots, the coercion of the majority communities over the minorities, the domination of powerful political groups, could be solved through non-violence ?

The question, however, is : Though non-violence is a most desirable thing, is it something practicable by an average man as easily as violence, or is it only a utopian dream of a handful of idealists living away from the storm and stress of real life in their selfmade hermitages ? In other words, are there any inexorable logic and compulsion behind the philosophy of non-violence making it workable and inevitable; or is it merely an idle, albeit very attractive dream like the

Utopian Socialism of Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, and Joseph Proudhan—the thought-luxury of hermits but the despair of common men?

Hence the votaries of non-violence must show that it is something, like the ultimate victory of socialism, logically tenable and practically feasible. They must also show that just as in the case of socialism, there are compulsive and inexorable forces in society which make non-violence not only logical but inevitable also. In other words, they must show that non-violence is not merely *one* of the many roads to peace, progress, and socialism, it is one and the only road to these.

Real life, however, seems to contradict and falsify the theories about non-violence. The existence of the word "genocide" itself is an argument against non-violence. Whole masses of people, men, women, and children, unarmed and helpless, have been and are being destroyed everywhere in the world. Let us not forget the murder camps of the Nazis or the horrors of India's partition when thousands of innocent people were subjected to horrible tortures and death. Even now Jews in Israel would be too happy if they could drive away or kill off all the poor Arabs living within their territories. If the fanatics had their way, the minority communities in India and Pakistan would have been driven away from their hearths and homes long ago.

It might pain us, yet it is true that neither logic nor social experience lends much support to non-violence. (Though that should not frighten the Gandhians, because, until Marx established socialism on a scientific foundation, it was poohpoohed as a utopian and unrealistic theory. Non-violence, too needs its Marx now.) Since the average man is guided chiefly by the pleasure-principle in life, why should he be non-violent, if that means any kind of sacrifice or suffering for him? On the other hand, why should he desist from violence if it secures him pleasure and profit or safeguards his property and privilege Is he not, willy-nilly, perpetrating violence everyday when he sits down to eat a leg of mutton, entraps and kills a rabbit in his field, gives a hearty thrashing to even an unsuccessful burglar, dismisses a sick and starving servant, and slaps his neighbour's son whose ball has accidentally uprooted his dahlias? If non-violence had any logical, psychological, or moral compulsion behind it, so many harmless, loving, and trustful animals, some of them bigger than man and as sensitive to pain and fear as he, would not have been sacrificed daily for man's pleasure.

Why should I not dispossess my neighbour of his home and property if I know that whatever harm I may do to him he will not harm me in return ? At best he would offer *satyagraha* at my door. If he does that what prevents me from kicking him away again and again ? Finally, if he proves too much of a nuisance by his non-violent persistence, what prevents me from hiring a roughneck and breaking his bones ?

It is unfortunate that the theorists of non-violence have not yet shown the logicality and inevitability of non-violence, as Marx showed regarding socialism. Their chief appeal is to people's morals and conscience. According to them non-violence awakens the conscience of even the cruellest tyrant. For example, if without going to war the Arabs offered non-violent resistance to the Jews, the conscience of the Jews would have awakened and they would have not only desisted from grabbing their land but probably would have returned them the lands they had already grabbed.

But the difficulty is that "morals and conscience" are vague and hypothetical words. Moreover, all men don't have the same morals nor have they the same conscience. What arouses your conscience, may not arouse mine. (Take for example making Urdu the joint official language of Bihar, which caused a blood-bath at Ranchi.) What is moral to you, may appear to be most immoral to me. (Take for example the ban on cow-slaughter, which caused violent riots in Delhi.) Over and above this, there are many people, not necessarily evil or vicious, who, like pure hedonists, want to live as happily as possible and are unwilling to bother themselves with complicated problems of morals and conscience. How can such people be influenced by non-violent action or attracted to non-violent theory ? From the battle of Mahabharata to the battle of Dien Bien Phu in Indo-China, history is replete with examples where justice and freedom could be obtained only through a violent struggle, On the other hand for one small example of the success of non-violence, you have to wade through pages of history.

In this brief essay I have tried to summarise the chief arguments of the critics of non-violence as a valid theory capable of practice. It now remains for the votaries of non-violence to answer them and prove that non-violence is not a utopian idea but a scientific theory sanctioned

by logic, human psychology, and the inflexible laws of social dynamics. Humanity is standing at the cross-roads of civilization like a lost child crying in anguish to find a way out of the vicious circle of violence and ever more violence. In this "crisis of civilization"; he feels, he has no future except a general annihilation, if violence cannot be eschewed and non-violence cannot be practised.

Votaries of non-violence have to respond to this cry of anguish of the human soul and show the way out of the vicious circle by elevating non-violence from a pious wish or righteous dream into a rational and effective guide to action firmly based on science, logic, and human nature. Will the Gandhians rise to the occasion, leave the safety of their homes and hermitages, and sound the call for an active, unceasing, uncompromising war against wars and violence wherever and by whomsoever perpetrated ? If the teachings of Buddha could succeed with half the world in an unenlightened and more violent period, there is no reason why Gandhian non-violence should not succeed in the modern age when mankind is facing the alternatives of peaceful transformation of society or violent upheavals and total extinction. If it does not, the fault will lie with the Gandhians, not with Gandhi's Teachings which were not properly developed by his unworthy disciples.

DISCUSSION

Sri S. S. Chakravarty:—In the first place, I would like to say you that I am not a Gandhian. I am not a Gandhian, of course, in the same sense that I am not a Christian or a Communist. But though *I* am not a Christian or a Communist, I have a very high respect for the teachings and the philosophy of Christ. Similarly, though I am not a Communist, I would like to follow socialism. In the same way, I have a very deep and abiding respect for Gandhiji and no one would be happier than me who would insist to follow his footsteps. Of course, in my short essay, I have not tried to throw any new light on Gandhism, neither I have discussed any fundamental question relating to Gandhiji. That is. for two reasons. In the first place, this can be done only by two categories of people. Firstly those who were directly attached with Gandhiji and have practised Gandhism in their whole life. Such

persons have every right to discuss Gandhism, develope it or criticise it and throw light over it. The second category of people are those who are scholars and have deep study of the teaching and philosophy of Gandhiji. They have also right to discuss Gandhism in an independent manner and throw some light upon it. I do not belong to any of these two categories. I am neither scholar of Gandhism nor its practitioner. But I represent a very important person. The person is the man in the street, the common man, for whom Gandhiji lived and died. As a man in the street, as a lay man, a very common man, I have very eagerly wished through out the life that the people should follow the path of Gandhiji, but I found how again and again not only other countries, but even our own countrymen have turned their heads from his teachings and his methods. So naturally I have been very much puzzled and have framed certain basic questions about Gandhism. Secondly as a common man, as a very ordinary common man of this world, whose life is threatned by the present violence and un-certainty which we find in our own country and abroad, I have also to read Gandhians, some of whom are present here. Naturally that is why the sub-title of my article is of much more importance than the title itself, because the sub-title is "Some Questions and an Appeal." I would request you to listen to me in that spirit. Please remember that I am not a specialist. I am representing the most humble person who is alšo most important in the world—the Common Man.

Sri Rajendra :—Please explain, what we actually desire and what is desirous in the context of Gandhism ?

Sri S. S. Chakrabarty :—I have amply discussed this through pages, but it has been found that many of the desirable things have been only utopian and remained unpracticable. It is not only Gandhism or non-violence or Ahimsa or Satyagrah.

Sri N. Mishra :—His difficulty is whether non-violence is practicable ?

Sri S. S. Chakrabarty :—Yes, my own appeal is that there should come some theoroticians, some of the Theoroticians who should prove in the world, to the common man, like me, that *non-violence is enevitable.* It cannot be avoided, just as Marxs did in the case of Socialism.

Sri Rajendra :—Yes, Kindly say what is distinction between

what is being practiced and what is practicable ? We cannot say that non-violence is not practised. We do not practise it, but on that ground we cannot say that this is not practicable. If there is any single instance then please confirm. It is hard to practice, but you cannot say that this is not practicable.

Sri S. S. Charabarty :—My answer is that so far votareies of non-violence are not prepared to go through the whole world to practice non-violence. Had they done it, then of course, the world would have accepted that non-violence can be practised. It is being practised wherever it went.

Dr. H. Rai :—I say that Gandhiji was a great man indeed. He was combination of many virtues, a great revolutionary, a great reformer, a great statesman and what not. He practised it. But was he really successful even one percent ? I think, no.

Sri S. S. Chakrabarty :—This is the basic problem of Gandhism. We find that some great men of the world, the religious and moral teachers, after they left the world, their teaching practically remained the life-force, for a number of centuries. They did not vanish from the world, so quickly and so easily as we find in the case of Gandhism. You take the example of Buddha and you take the example of Marx himself. We find that even now though Marx died long ago, his teaching and Philosophy are still a source of tremendous inspiration to a large number of people throughout the world.

Dr. Ramjee Singh :—Prof. Chakrabarti wants theo-reticians to prove that "non-violence is *inevitable* and *unavoidable*." But this attitude, I am afraid, will lead to a soul-less "determinism" and consequent inactivity and perssimism. If anything is *inevitable*, there is no scope for human effort. Man submits to *fate* or *nature*. However, if Prof. Chakrabarti simply wants some justifications for upholding the doctrine of non-violence, he will find them in abundance. Let me illustrate this point. Violence & war have lost their dynamics in this atomic age. Modern war will be atomic in method and international in its sweep. Hence, war will mean utter annihilation hence disarmament has become a necessity. Thus non-violence is inevitable and unavoidable. even in our social and national life, violence is not supported because human life and society is based on non-violence or love. Similarly, there are psychological, sociological and other justifica-

ions for non-violent way of life. Violence is the way of the jungle ind its has no place today in this stage of human civilization.

I also agree to a great extent that no name has been more misutilised than that of Gandhiji. It is true. But that is a different question. Names of Buddha, Jesus and Marx have been misutilised. The Christian world is mostly un-Christian or why there would have been Vietnam or Hundred Years Wars ? It is the same thing with Gandhi.

Sri S. S. Chakravarty :—It was not the fault of Gandhism, but it was the fault of his desciples.

Dr. Ramji Singh : —Your question centres round one particular point, that how can practice be brought nearer to theory ? I think you should better give up the professions of Gandhites.

Sri B. B. Chatterjee :—I have to express a few points. There should be theoretical super-structure to establish the logical consistency of Gandhism. Now I think a small research has already been started. Let me name of two persons whom you must be knowing. One is an Economist in the Machigun University, Professor Keneth Boi, who had gone to East in Action Peace Research. The Type of thinking that he has developed is very clear, that Gandhian thinking is better form of strategy in bringing the resolution of conflicts.

Another man is Prof. Gycle. He is the Director of the Oslo Peace Research Institute. He has also developed the same type of thesis, that in the type of situation we are going through, there is no other alternative, but to try our strategies which are non-violent, which can bring together world parties and show on logical glance, where different parties are playing games—games of war you see, for different pairs. Now question is that how we can take strategy so that my game is maximised. A co-operative game where Gandhian non-violence may be used, may maximise the play for both the parties, for all the world parties. This sort of thing is going on.

Sri Janki Prasad Singh :—He has raised questions rather than answered them. I would like to say that we are too near Gandhi to assess him. There must be a perspective to look at something and we are so near to Gandhiji that we have not been able to assess him. You know there is a period of inculcation and who knows that period of

inculcation is there. I have reasons to believe as I have heard from my friends who have come from America. One Indian friend who had been there, came and said that there was a meeting on the teachings of Gandhiji. He spoke something. He also said that he had the opportunity in his life to touch Gandhi. Then one young lady aged about 21, stood up and said, "Mumyv, this man, Mr. Prasad is keedying. He could not have seen Gandhi. He could not have touched his feet," So there are ladies in America who feel that Gandhi was more than a God, who could not have been seen, could not have been touched. So, my point is that it is not very correct to say that Gandhism is dying or Gandhites are not taking action or other Gandhites are not coming up. They will come up as a matter of compulsion. We are going towards peace.

Krishna Ballav Kumar Singh,
Lecturer, Deptt. of Sociology,
Bhagalpur University.

GANDHI'S VIEWS ON LANGUAGE PROBLEM

GANDHI, the father of the Indian Nation, leader of the freedom movement, prophet and saint, was also a social philosopher and thinker-par-excellence.

He wrote and spoke on almost all the aspects of the human society. The language problem is no exception

As we know, we were under the grim grip of Britishers since a long time. Hence we had been slave to them in every respect. They entered into every branch of our life.

Our educational system was controlled, guided and regulated according to their aspirations and cherished desires. English, practically was the "lingua franca" because it was essential to learn it right from the childhood.

Gandhijee declared his love for the English language in its own place but called himself its inveterate enemy if it tried to usurp the position of India's lingua franca. He considered its use decidedly harmful to our political and cultural interests and pronounced its unsuitable for use as a medium of instruction, as a means of promoting a national spirit and as an instrument of administration.

He firstly felt disgusted and indignant about the educational system which was introduced by the British. The first attack which he directed against it was in respect of the medium of instruction. He condemned English as a medium of instruction because it put immense strain on the students. He argued that the time which a child ordinarily takes to master the vagaries of the English language can be better used for imparting the essential knowledge about some of the basic facts of civil life. He said "The foreign medium has caused brain fag, put an undue strain upon the nerves of our children, made them crammers and immitators unfitted them for original work and thought, and disabled them from filtrating their learning to the family or the masses." The foreign medium has made our children practically foreigners in their own land. Besides that, he described it as an economic waste to make provision for the teaching of English when we had not got the means to introduce even free compulsory primary education.

In the political sphere, Gandhiji viewed the retention of English as so much cultural loss to the nation. In his opinion "our love of English has created a deep chasm between the educated and politically minded classes and the masses." He considered the foreign language a barrier which deprived the common people of the benefit of new ideas.

He was anxious for the common man to be convinced that as a result of India gaining freedom, he had come into his own. He, therefore, advocated assigning the highest priority to the rivival of India's regional languages. Because, regional languages are mother languages among the people of India in different states, he was not prepared to accept the plea that it would take some time to make the change. He called such thinking as a product of mental sluggishness and stood banishing Englisn as a "cultural usurper", just as the foreign rulers had been banished as political usurpers. He called upon his countrymen to get rid of the blighting imposition which threaten to rob the nation of its soul.

Referring to the use of English as an instrument of administration, Gandhiji did not subscribe to the view that works in the legislatures, the law courts & the government offices could not be carried on except through English. In his opinion, the regional languages could be easily adopted to such use. The administrative system will become strong if the regional language is an instrument to it. The works of law courts, legislatures and Govt. offices will be satisfactory with the help of regional language. The people of the regions will feel pleasure and ease in presence of their own respective languages. He held that English in any case could never become India's official or national language : for the simple reason that it was spoken and understood by a small minority only.

Expressing his opinion on the question, he laid down five requirements which a language aspiring for such a position should meet. These requirements were :—

1. It should be easy to learn for Govt. Officials.

2. It should be capable of serving as a medium of religious economic and political inter-course throughout India.

3. It should be the speech of the majority of the inhabitants of India,

It should be easy to learn for the whole of the country.

In choosing this language, considerations of temporary or passing interests should not count.

After applying these tests to English, Gandhiji found that it did ot fulfil any of the requirement, where as Hindi among all the respec- ive languages of India and being the mother tongue of a great majority f the common countrymen came nearest to satisfying all the five equirements adumbrated by him. And following his suggestions, the arliament also decided that Hindi should be a national and link anguage of the country. The present three language formula is a onsequence of his thinking.

Lastly he said "The most proper, and under all the circums- ances, the only possible thing would be to use the "language of the province in the province'', to use "Hindi" for all India purposes and o use "English" for international purposes. At the same time, in order to arrest the growth of any process of disintegration or multipli- cation of languages, he suggested that "Devnagri" should be adopted as the common script for all regional languages.

The language problem which is current in our country is facing many difficulties in reaching its solution. Though the Central Govt. has passed the three language formula and attributed the status of National language to Hindi yet obstacles are there from some regions within the country. South India particularly Madras, is not ready to accept this proposal and decision of the Govt. at any cost. C. N. Anna- durai, the D. M. K. leader and present Chief Minister of Madras, speaking on the occasion of "Tamil language world conference", said that Tamil inplace of Hindi should be a link language. The anti-Hindi agitation in several states of the country manifests that there is no unanimity among the countrymen as yet on this problem. Hence, We have not been able to achieve success in solving our language problem. Gandhijee also advocated that Devnagri should be the common script for all regional languages, but it has not yet been accepted by our countrymen. Difference of opinion is still continuing. Untill and unless, the gulf of opinion of the countrymen is bridged, his views can't become a reality. The time has come, we should try to solve the problem and make his views relevant.

Note : There was no important discussion on this paper–Ed.

Dr. Narmadeshwar Jha,
University Professor & Head of the Deptt. of Economics,
Bhagalpur University.

NOTES ON ECONOMIC WRITINGS OF MAHATMA GANDHI.

Mahatma Gandhi's economic writings were written in the weekly columns of his journals over a long stretch of time—some forty years from 1908 to 1948. In them he poured forth from week to week his views on all kinds of problems facing the country, groups and individuals. It is from these discontinuous pieces of writings that Gandhi's views on economics, his vision of the Indian economy or his analysis of the contemporary economic problems or the economic policies he suggested are to be picked out. But if one puts them together a very coherent picture of his views on economic policy for India does certainly emerge. It is this picture which I am trying to reconstruct and interpret in the pages that follow :

Like Alfred Marshall Mahatma Gandhi came to Economics via Ethics; and the book which, for the first time, brought him face to face with economic and moral issues which were to concern him for the rest of his life was John Ruskin's Unto This Last, "During the days of my education" Gandhiji writes in his autobiography (P.364)", I had read practically nothing outside text books, and after I launched into active life I had very little time for reading. I can not therefore claim much book knowledge. But the limited reading may be said to have enabled me thoroughly to digest what I did read. Of these books, the one that brought about an instaneous and practical transformation in my life was Unto This Last (the book he later translated as Sarvodaya–Welfare of all). The teachings of Unto This Last I understood to be :

1- That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.

2- That the Lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's, in as much as all have the same right of earning their livelihood from their work.

3- That a life of Labour i. e the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman, is the life worth living. The first of these I knew. The second I had dimly realised. The third had never occurred to me. Unto This Last made it as clear as daylight to me that the second and the third were contained in the first. I arose with the

dawn, ready to reduce these principles to practice. "John Ruskin was one of the pioneers of the new British School of Social Sciences (the others being Cliffe Leslie, David Syme, J. K. Ingram, Toynbee and Cunningham) which had arisen in England in the 1870's, after the authority of the Ricardians had gone. This school made a great effort to make Political Economy one of the Departments of Social Sciences or Sociology, subordinated to Ethics. It owed its theoretical origin partly to the influence of Christian Socialists of the earlier decades; partly to Comte and the English Positivsts and partly to the German Historical School of Knies, Roscher and Schmoller. The similarity of the Economic writings of members of this School and those of Mahatma Gandhi is quite obvious. I would just give one instance : One of the main things on which the economists of the historical School put great emphasis was the principle of the relativity of economic doctrines and policies as against the cosmopolitan Economics of Adam Smith. Gandhiji believed in this and never, failed to emphasis that India's economics and economic policies are and must be different from those of the advanced countries of the West :

"The principles of Economics are not like the principles of Mathematics, for instance, immutable, and for all times and climes. England will not accept the economics of France, nor France that of Germany, nor Germany that of America, and they would be wrong if they did so. A country which produces no foodstuffs and produces only minerals must have different economics from that which produces foodstuffs but has no mineral resources. India therefore, can not afford to go by the economics of France, England, America or Germany. How can a country with crores of living machines afford to have a machine which will displace the labour of crores of living machines ? It would spell their unemployment and their ruin. If we neglect our duty to our villages we shall be courting our own ruin" (Harijan March 1, 1935 p. 24 (9 m & m P 311). Or take another instance : A poor undeveloped country like India is not to be judged as a highly developed individualist island like Great Britain may be. What is good for Great Britain to day is in my opinion in many respects poison for India. India has got to develop her own economics, her own policy, her own method in dealing with her industries, and everything else"

(Young India Dec. 17, 1931 P 395 (quoted by Mathur & Mathur of M. Gandhi's Economic Thought–P. 440)

Obviously Gandhiji was pleading for a National Political Economy based on postulates derived from the economic realities of the country, and in this Gandhi had already been anticipated apart from the Historical School economists of other countries, by eminent Indian economists who had preceded him, namely Dadabhai Naoroji, Ranade, R. C. Dutta and G. K. Gokhale. As is well known, these economists had been equally concerned with developing a more appropriates policy frame for India's contemporary economic problems and for the long term problems of her economic development and were influenced by the German and British Historical School of economists. To appreciate the economics of Mahatma Gandhi one must be aware of these two traditions to which he came to be an heir; as also of the latest brand of post-war economics which is known as the economics of under-developed countries primarily concerned with problems of their economic development.

Gandhiji was greatly disturbed by India's appalling poverty which was caused by British rule and the destruction of India's village industries particularly of spinning and weaving in the 19th. century as a consequence of the policies followed by the British Govt., and which he beleived was every day getting worse. This poverty was caused by unemployment of India's artisans and underemployment of India's agriculturists; and in this he followed and took R. C. Dutta's economic analysis as his point of departure.

As a cure as is well known, he recommended restoration to villages of their lost industries. This led him first to recommend the Khadi and the spinning wheel as an immediate cure to the villager's problem of underemployment and poverty, and subsequently to favour development of all possible village industries with Khadi as nucleus. Here also Gandhiji was in agreement with R. C. Dutta who unlike his Bombay contemporaries (Ranade and Gokhale) wanted to develop village and cottage industries, and did not approve of their desire to go in for establishment of large scale industries.

As I have said the main economic problem to which Gandhiji addressed himself was employment and underemployment, one should compare his writings to the contemprary writtings of British economists on the same theme. Gandhiji was as much concerned with the problem of enforced idleness in India as they were with problems of involuntary unemployment. He was also concerned like them with problems of

Capital-labour relationship, Strikes and peaceful resolution of differences between capitalists and labourers problems of minimum wage etc. Gandhiji was not unaware of the permanent problems of India's agriculture-but he thought that no immediate programme for agricultural development could be undertaken without far-reaching assistance by Govt. (See the author's *Age of Marshall*, Novelty & Co. Patna chapter on Unemployment). He therefore, emphasised development of Khadi as the only possible immediate programme as a remedy for unemployment and poverty, and devoted considerable part of his energy to implement such a programme independently of the Govt., and to persuade his contemporaries to accept this programme as the only possible way out of the difficulties of the dumb millions of India. I think Gandhi's practical instinct was quite correct. Because of her huge population (as Gandhiji insisted) conventional development of large scale industry can not solve the problem of India's Rural unemployment and underemployment. This fact has been brought home to us all after our experience of 15 years of planning. A policy of full employment in India will have to incorporate many of Gandhiji's ideas of village industrialisation.

To create a market for Khadi and products of the village industries Gandhiji emphasised Swadeshi : He wanted to create a country-wide loyalty for the products of the country-even though it meant paying a some what higher price. This was building up a system of voluntry protection, He developed in connection with Khadi his idea of a living wage on which alone the pricing of Khadi was to be based. He also emphasised how the development of Khadi led to the development of a number of other auxilliary economic activities-which we, in modern jargon, call 'backward and forward linkage effects.'

Gandhiji's writings on labour economics compare very favourably with contemporary writings on these aspects in Britain. Gandhiji approved of well organised Trade Unions, emphasised peaceful solution of capital-labour disputes, emphasised conciliation and arbitration, advised labour to avoid irresponsible strikes unequivocally, disapproved of strikes in public utilities, municipal services, post-offices etc. These were exactly the views which were generally held by academic economists in Britain in the 1920's and in the early years of the century and have now come to be widely accepted. In the field of Public Finance Gandhiji's writings were quite well informed and sound, by

contemporary standards. I think he must have been influenced by Gokhale in this field. Gandhiji disapproved of large military expenditures by the British Govt., approved of discrimination in taxation on grounds of equity and to improve the plight of the poorer sections, advocated the abolition of the salt tax and the provincial excises, and recommended adoption of a tax on inheritances and of death duties to make up the loss.

If one approaches Gandhiji's economic writings from the standpoint of present day writings on economic growth, one is struck by his insistance on desirable institutional changes and changes in prevalent values and attitudes such as Hindu–Muslim Unity, eradication of untouchability, emancipation of women, realisation of the dignity of human labour, correct habits of living, punctuality etc. development and increased use of the country's own languages in place of English, development of education and a host of other things. These things are now considered necessary for making the human factor and the institutional background more favourable for economic development in a backward country. Gandhiji gave them great importance in his constructive programme and considered them as a precondition for achievement of Swaraj or Ram Rajya.

Gandhiji did not approve of the existing inequalities. He wanted the rich to consider themselves the trustees of the poor. He wanted no one to possess large property in land or in other things, larger than what one needed. In the 1940's, i. e. towards the end of his life he came to favour socialistic reorganisation of Indian economy if the transition to it was non-violent and gradual. (See his replies to letters from Dr. R. M. Lohia and Sri J. P. Narayan, Harijan, January 27, 1940 and April 20, 1940). He did not want reforms to be rushed. Gandhiji wanted India to be self-sufficient in Food and clothing as also in all other things which could be produced within the country.

Gandhiji's economic writings are not free from value judgements. But it is impossible as professional people now realise to make economics value free. Gandhiji did not want one to multiply one's wants without limit. He considered this to be one of the vices of the modern industrial civilisation, and he did not want India to copy this. There was little happiness he thought in an endless quest for material comforts and liesure. It is against the background of such a view that Gandhiji's ideas to make our villages self-sufficient and to have only limited industrialisation in India are to be understood. These flowed

from Gandhiji's basic belief and his other-wordly values; but I often think that even from the point of view of maximising happiness there is much to be said for such views.

In Mahatma Gandhi's economic writings one thus finds the Hindu (or the religious) emphasis on the non-economic-ethical-aspects of life. Happiness of simple life, curtailment of wants, control of technology limitation of machinery, decentralisation of economic activity are all emphasised. If economic growth is to be self-reliant, and foreign aid is not resorted to, assumptions which Gandhiji always considered desirable and correct to make at the time of he lived and wrote, these ideas can not be ignored in poor countries with very large populations. To the extent Gandhiji found them relevant and was not swept off by the conventional economic wisdom of his time, he was developing a more appropriate approach to problems of unemployment and of economic development in India.

In this respect like all great economists he was concerned with contemporary economic issues before the country; but his tools of analysis were mostly those he inherited from Nationalist economists of India such as Naoroji, Gokhale, Dutta and the Christian Socialists such as Ruskin and Tolstoy. Very often he came to his conclusions as a result of his own observations, and later, came across a similar view expressed elsewhere. Though he did not get a formal training in economics, and never attempted a systematic exposition of his economic views, his informed common sense, his shrewed practical sense, his sense of facts (which he had as a lawyer) his detached devotion to Karma, led him to make correct diagnosis of the economic malaise from which three quarters of India suffered and to offer immediately applicable solutions. I do not think a better analysis and remedy for the problems of Rural India has still been found.

DISCUSSION

Sri Siya Sharan Singh :—Dr. Jha has specially mentioned the linkage effect of handicraft technology for the economic development of India. But he did not think that the so–called 'Linkage' effects are so small in the handicraft technology that this effect will not work in this context. It has, I think, been estimated by Dr. S. P. Singh, to be near about 0.5 and the linkage effects of other advanced industries are enormous. Hence the linkage effect is not applicable in this case. Cottage industries themselves are lagging and they will not come forward to drive our economy to the path of economic development.

As regards his emphasis on attitudes for economic development, may I point out that Gandhiji emphasised on plain living. Plain living does not induce our workmen to go in for more production. He will be satisfied with the simple food he gets and the cloths he wears. So he will not feel strong attitude to develop his own productive capacity. It has been found by some empirical investigations that the small producers do not aim at the maximisation of output, but at the maximisation of leisure. Thus, the village industries under the control of small producers, will reduce the gross output in the economy. So, Gandhiji's economic ideas do not seem relevant in the present context. Further, the problem of un–employment is so acute that it will not be solved by the village industries. It will not solve the problem of un-employment, rather it will lead to the maximisation of under-employment in our economy. The capital invested, is small in small-scale industries and the absorption capacity is very limited in them. Hence, it will reduce our surplus and the employment in investment sector, or the advanced sector, employment in which depends upon the surplus available from the village sector. So, if the surplus is small in village industries sector, it will ultimately reduce our national income and employment in the long-run.

Dr. N. Jha :—I have already mentioned the formal defects and Gandhiji was also aware of those defects, of possible push which Khadi would give to us. Gandhiji felt that the hosts of other industries which were linked up with Khadi, should be developed. It may be developed by the cotton cultivation, it might be developed by the improvement of Charkha, and it might be developed by the village carpentary work and so on It will lead to the growth of other industries. It is useless to show that Gandhiji were aware of the

kinds of firms which we have now observed. I mean to say that the linkage effects are formal.

About plain living and economic development, I would say that this is quite obvious to any body that plain living would mean less consumption and expenditure than done in Western countries. The plain living may apply to resources we have for our development. If we emphasise curtainment of expenditure, that is we emphasise plain living which Gandhiji emphasised, certainly there will be more scope for economic development.

As to the employment in village industries, all that we can say, is that large scale industries in our country are less. Of course, if we would not have large scale industries in large number in our country, at least in the short run, the prospect of employment would be very limited. Even in this respect, in the periods of capital shortage, if we emphasise the small scale industries as Gandhiji emphasised, the problem of unemployment may be solved.

It is true that in small scale industries more labourers are to be employed and there is less surplus, less profit. If we consider that the size of profit in an economy is the main vehicle for the economic development, then in this respect, there would be antecedent policy of the village industries and would lead to the sinking of the surplus and would slow down our growth. But that is a different matter. I think Gandhiji was not full-fledged theorist of economic growth. I can only saythat there are elements in his writings which fit in very well with our modern theory of growth and he was thinking in his time of those problems of the country.

Dr. Ramji Singh :—But what about reduction in national income ?

Dr. N. Jha :—As to the size of the national income, Gandhiji felt that so much labourers are going to be wasted. If they could be employed some-how in spinning or weaving, then these idle labourers would be having something. So many people remain unemployed for three or four months of a year and if this labour which is going to be wasted, is profitably used and made to yield something, they would certainly add to national income. Gandhiji felt that by making more and more people work, we would easily increase our national income. Because there was no better opportunity available for the employment,

spinning or weaving could be utilised and the national income could be raised certainly.

Dr. Ramji Singh :—But by this view do you mean to say that Gandhiji's economics is economics of compulsion ?

Dr. N. Jha : - Yes, all economics problems are in a way, problems of compulsion. We work in economy as we think that there are problems of scarcity and economics is problem of scarcity and we are compelled to work. Probably if man did not have any economic problem then he would not have worked for earning living. So in this respect, there are elements of compulsion in economic activity.

Dr. Kedar Ram Gupta :—In the scheme of Cottage industries, work is essential but suppose people do not choose to work. In that case, has Gandhiji to offer some subsitute for incentive which is the basis of economic growth ?

Secondly, whether Gandhian approach is a pragmatic approach or scientific approach ?

Dr. N. Jha :—Gandhi's writings were bound by some experience and some periodical experiments. Gandhiji never ceased to emphasise that what he was offering, was any final solution for India's economic problems which he considered to be unemployment in rural areas. He did not write about agriculture very much, as I have already said, because agricultural reconstruction recall all kinds of Government's assistance which he could not draw on his way. So, remember with these two limitations, behind Gandhi's economics, that he was not sure of government's assistance. In a number of place government's attitude to aid India's agricultural development, was not as it should be. So he did not touch the problem of agriculture. He only emphasised the industries in the rural areas—Khadi, spining, weaving. And these village industries of course, are the solutions of unemployment problem. As I have expressed, when India became free and ministries were established in the centre, and states Gandhiji's approach became vital. He brought in agriculture in his perview. Gandhiji wrote to introduce elements of corporation in farming; he wrote even for reorganising agriculture. That means Gandhiji's scope of the solution offered for India's economic difficulties widened to at the end of his life. So one has to bear this remark. My impression is that early Gandhi was mainly concerned with automatic programme of economic development.

He was willing to accept state assistance for re-organisation in the economy which included rural industries as well as agriculture. Swadeshi had already been emphasised. Swadeshi means accepting time to use country's own products and this is obvious thing to do when we are faced with the balance of payment problem. If a country is faced with the balance of payment problem, you cut-down your imports, which means you have do with what is produced at home. The imports of only those things which you recall you cannot do without them; and you can do without those things which you can grow yourself, or you produce yourself. Now this Swadeshi means complete control of a country's exports and imports. In this sense, Swadeshi has been in prominent feature in our country's economics. If you are rich in foreign exchange, then you can do away with the principle of Swadeshi. You can buy things you like from outside, but if you cannot afford it, then you cut down your imports. Now Gandhiji considered this to be a promiment law of living, that is the difference between Gandhiji and the modern economists. A modern economist would cut down imports, if they become necessary. But Gandhiji, because he lived in a moral value, thought that the nation should not get from outside what it could produce at home. So this was the view.

Dr. Kedar Ram Gupta
MARWARI COLLEGE
BHAGALPUR

A NON-VIOLENT ECONOMY AND ITS RELEVANCE TO PRESENT DAY INDIA : A GANDHIAN APPOARCH.

Gandhiji writes in Harijan (1940) that the Charkha must lead to Swaraj in terms of masses belonging to all faiths. It restores villages to their rightful place and abolishes distinction between the high and the low...the lovers of liberty of India were introduced to non-violence as the only sure means of Swaraj and to the Charkha as a symbol of non-violence. There is no symbol of non-violance than the Charkha. Without its universlisation there would be no visible expression of non-violence (Harijan, 13-1-40 quoted by the Economic and Industrial Life Vol. I, page Lxvvii) Further he says that society based on non-violence can only consist of groups settled in villages in which voluntary co-operation is the condition of dignified and peaceful existence. (The Modern Review, October 1935 quoted by Economic and Industrial Life). Then again writing in the Harijan in 1939 (Harijan 28-1-39) he says that the natural economy (or non-violent economy) would consist of a harmonious integration of large scale production with village handicrafts. They can be harmonised if they are planned so as to help the villages. Elaborating his view of revitalising the countless economic units, that is villages, Gandhiji says. The village communities should be revived. Indian villages produced and supplied to the Indian towns and cities all their wants. India became impoverished when our cities became foreign markets and began to drain the villages dry by dumping cheap and shoddy goods from foreign markets. (quoted by Economic and Industrial Life and Relation Vol. I, a Navjivan Trust Publication).

The above excerpts from his writing present the main constituents which help in building up the concept of non-violent economy. In the first place, Charkha or the spinning wheel which is the symbol of non-violence because the wide use of Charkha in the countless villages of India would lead to unconcentrated growth of wealth distributed all over the country. Concentration of economic power itself leads to violence. Gandhiji says in Harijan (29. 8. 36) "The State represents violence in a concentrated and organised from. The individual has a soul but as the State is soulless machine it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence.

Then in the second place, non-violent economy can operate

successfully only when people in small groups are settled in villages and these villages co-operate with each other. They are not in conflict with each other. In the third place, people in villages offer co-operation to each other in economic and other activities in a dignified manner. In the fourth place which follows from the third, dignified individuals lived in peace and in a dignified manner. Fifthly, there must be a meaningful and effective integration of large scale production with village handicrafts. The large scale production must be proposefully harmonised with viilage-crafts. Sixthly, villages should be revived and revitalised in a manner that they are sufficiently capacitated to supply the needs of the towns which they did at one time.

Gandhiji made no secret of his view that primarily he thought in terms of villages. He writes in Constructive Programme -Khadi must be taken with all its implication. It means a whole scale Swadeshi mentality, a determination to find all the necessaries of life in India and that through the labour and intellect of the villages. That is to say instead of half a dozen cities of India..living on the exploitation and the ruin of 7,00,000 villages of India, the latter will be largely self-contained, and will voluntarly serve the cities of India and even the outside world in so far as it benefits both the parties. (Young India, 21. 8. 24) quoted by Economic and Industrial Life Vol. 1, page Lxxv).

Why he chose Charkha as a symbol of his non-violent economy is explained by him in these words : it supplies the readiest occupation to those who have leisure and are in want of a few coppers; it is known to the thousands; it is easily learnt; its requires practically no outlay or captial; the wheel can be easily and cheaply made; the people have no repugnance to it; it affords immediate releif in times of famine and scarcity; it can alone stop the drain of wealth, which goes out in the purchase of foreign cloth; it automatically distributes the millions thus saved among the deserving poor; even the smallest success means so much immediate gain to the people; it is the most potent instrument of securing co-operation among the people. (Young India—21. 8. 24; Economic and Industrial Lifes Relation, page Lxxiii).

Now if we correlate his saying that Charkha is the symbol of non-violence with his above explanation as to its desirability we can construct a premise of his non-violent economy as (a) The economy is a job oriented economy, (b) the means of production must be available ready (c) the acquiring of the means must not

require huge capital, (d) the means whereby the millions and millions of people get employment must be locally and cheaply made, (e) the means of production must afford immediate relief in times of famine and scarcity, (f) the production must save the national wealth from being drained out, (g) the wealth so produced must get automatically distributed among the poor and deserving and must not lead to concentration and accumulation in fewer hands and lastly the people so engaged in the operation of the means to produce wealth must lead to co-operation among the people.

Thus it is clear that non-violent economy means an economy (1) of the widest possible dispersal of the means and opportunity of employment and job, (2) of non-concentration of wealth and means of living (3) of production with the help of locally available and manufactured means as far as practicable, (4) of the wide distribution of the wealth so producted among the people, (5) of the wealth saved from being drained to foreign agency or country, (6) of cooperation and no conflict among the people who are engaged in production.

Non-violence of Gandhiji's concept is absence of explanation of any sort or at any stage. That is why he emphasises on the widest possible dispersal in the productive, distributive and consumption part of the economy. He disposed with the need of huge capital formation as a means of setting up industries leading to industrialism. He is against industrialism but not industrialisation which should bring about rejuvination of village commun ities.

The question of mill and village industries :—Gandhiji solved this riddle by writing in Young ındian (12. 1, 28) "there is not the slightest reason why spinning wheel may not coexist with the spinning mill even as the domestic kitchen coexists with hotel" (quoted by Economic and Industrial Life and Relation Vol. 1, page Lxxii) we have already noted earlier that Gandhiji never ruled out the industry part of his non-violent economy provided it is harmonised and integrated with the millions upon millions productive interprises spread all over the length and breadth of the country.

The psycho-ethical basis of non-violent economy : —Gandhiji writes "Swaraj really means self control" (Conclusion : a parapharse of Ruskin's Un to the last.) It (Khadi) means a wholesale swadeshi mentality a determination to find all the necessary of life in India and

that through the labour and intellect of villages.' (Constructive Programme. Economic and Industrial Life and Relation Vol. 1 page Lxxv) "This immediately takes us to contentment and simplicity voluntaraly adopted. Under new outlook multiplicity of material wants will not be the aim of life; the aim will be rather restriction consistent with comforts. We shall cease to think of getting what can but shall decline to receive what all can not get." (Young India 3. 9. 25. we same as above, page xiix) Translated into modern economic ideology the psycho-ethical basis constitute the policy of protection and subsidy to home industries and putting an embargo upon unbriddled dumping of foreign goods. Then again if the vissci-tude of capital and capitalist have got to be avoided then the millions of consumers have to chose the way of swadeshi and the use of village industries manufatured articles, Gandhiji's approach refers to a correspondence between wishing and doing. What Gandhiji has sought to achieve by voluntary offer of the people is otherwise done by obligatory legislation and state compulsion. He gives highest priority to the individual and not to the state or any coercive agency alternative to his way is state capitalism based on concentration of economic and political power which Gandhiji shuns.

So far we have delt with the conceptual aspect of the non-violant economy as propounded by Gandhiji from time to time in his writing in Harijan, Young India, Constructive programme and Hind Swaraj and other work. Now let us see how far the cult of non-violent economy is relevent to the economic malaise from which our country, a country of devloping economy suffers.

The whole question of economic emancipation of the teeming millions of Indians living in tens and tens of thousands of villages is how to reach economic Swaraj to them. Despite the three successive plans, things have not been bettered up materially if we look to the millions of millions of our countrymen. The per Capita national dividened has increased, per capita yardage of cloth consumption has increased, the total amount of national wealth compared with the help of valuation of produced wealth in a particular year has increased, industrial and agricultural production per capita has gone up. In this way the per capita calculation procedure to assess the prosperity leads to some amount of satisfaction. But what is the actual state of affairs if a man to man or for that matter family to family survey on actual inspection is made. Has the face of villagers and villages changed

materially ? Do prosperity, health, happiness peep out of the faces, and homes of the villagers ? Have the villages started supplying the needs to the towns and cities ? Have the villages taken up things of life with the locally available tools and implements ? I do not think India in the millions and millions of villages have emerged in the matter in which Gandhiji dreamt. It is never meant to underestimate the acheivement of the three successive Plans. What is argued out here is that had Gandhian approach to the problems of the common man been adopted, things would have been far different.

As such, a rethinking and fresh stock taking in respect of planning is needed. The method of total planning where emphasis is laid on sectors of economy should be kept in abeyance in favour of planning whereby productive and employment opportunity and means should be widely distributed all over the country in an effective manner so that each and every village is turned to a productive unit. Villages should be converted intp agro-industrial base and certain types of industries such as consumption goods, industries should be allocated to the villages. Machinary should be specially designed to suit the local conditions. Food, cloth, agricultural tools and other industrial requirements should be produced in the villages. That is, the villages should be the calculation unit and target and not the amount of money allocated for certain target. Villages should be made attractive and productive by e ffective house planning, road planning, power planning and more of modern amenities should be made available in the villages. Gandhiji wanted the flow from the town to the villages to be reversed. That is the largest relevance of Gandhian approach. Big consumption good industries should be broken and splitted up so that the villages may cope with it. Agriculture should be given highest priority because Gandhiji would have never liked the shortage of foodgrains and import of the same in lakhs and crores of tons every year. He wanted self-reliant village community, let alone foodgrains going to them as imported from outside the country as a Satayagrahi he would have liked in aking his all rather than taking imported grains

Decentralised and dispersed planning of the local, rigional economy to make them self-operating as far as practicable is the governing tone of non-violent economy as conceived by Gandhiji.

In 1935 in Harijan, Gandhiji wrote that he was for state ownership of heavy industries. Manufacture of sewing machine printing press

and surgical instruments were instances of heavy industries given by him. Therefore there is no querrel about heavy industries. In factthey shall be there. It appears therefore that the major resources and attention should be shifted to so industrialising villages and planning the economy that the economic benefit may keep flowing to the common man without delay.

DISCUSSION

A blind student : –What is the basis if Gandhian economy ?

Dr. Kedar Ram Gupta :—You see, one thing is there. There is psycho-ethical approach in Gandhian philosophy of industries. If we want employment and job, we have to prefer Khadi. You cannot have different alternative. If you believe in terryline and all these things, naturally there would be no jobs for our countrymen. Gandhian economy is an economy of self-help and help to the poor and down trodden. The major part of the price that we pay for Khadi goes to the spinners, to the weavers, to the growers etc. That is one of the justifications for Gandhian approach.

Dr. N Jha :—Gandhiji felt that all the necessary heavy industries were to be in the hands of the State. Surprisingly enough, Gandhiji felt that the villages should be self-sufficient in food, clothing and all other vital needs. But he felt that if even by this unemployment problem would not be solved, then all the cotton cloth mills were to be dismantled. All public goods which were necessary were to be in the hands of state. In this early wrirings like Hind Swaraj, Gandhiji emphasised that there should not be State control and ownership, and so on. But later on he said that what he talked about Hind Swaraj was an ideal. Then views, he expressed in 1910, in 1920 and 1930 did not cover to some of the things which he mentioned in the Hind-Swaraj.

Dr, S. N. Thakur
Department of Economics
Bhagalpur University,

GANDHI'S RELEVANCE FOR MODERN TIMES

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO GANDHIAN ECONOMICS

Turn the pages of the History of human races. I wisb, you had one thousand fingers and an equal number of eyes, since it is no small claim, I am going to make and your task is no trifle. There are pages and pages – you donot know how many, if one day's events in one hundred square miles cover ond page, you would not need a rocket to reach the moon, but just climb this volume and get to the moon one side and come down the other side.

In such a vast history of the world, there is one solitary individual who has no equal and there is one event which has no parellel. The name of the man is Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi; the event, Indian independence through non-violent struggle.

Reformers there had been and many- Buddha, Confucious, Socrates, Aristotle, Mohammed and others. The list of statesmen also is heavy with names like Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin, Bismark, Lincoln, Henery VIII, Demosthenes and others having superior or equal claim. And philosophers there are many, Ruskin, who influenced Gandhi, Tolstoy, Kant, Hegel. etc.

But Gandhi is a solitary example of a man, who combined a reformer's zeal with the acumen of a practical statesman,—so practical that hard boiled British politicians were outwiteed on all conference tables, round or rectangular. They failed to decide whether Gandhi was a friend or a foe, since with the best of intentions and good will towards both India and Britain, what he did destroyed one of the mightiest of all empires that the world has seen, which even the sun could not avoid, take how many rounds he did.

Without being a first rate philosopher, Gandhi's simplicity of thought, unflinching conviction and dogged adherence to truth, give him a significant position amongst the galaxy of great philosophers.

I go this far, but no further. I do not think that Gandhi's philosophy of simple living could be a panacea for all modern ills. I do not accept the view that the strategy of truth and non-violence

will solve the problems of fighting sections or warring nations. I can not agree with the view that the Gandhian system of self-sufficient villages and non-mechanised production ean solve the economic problems of the teeming millions.

Gandhian model is a simple one, saintly and two dimensional whereas the world and society are complex, crooked and multidimensional. Gandhi deals with simple equations of the first degree, the Modern Times have problems which are complex equations of *nth* degree consisting of *n* variables.

Let us mind it. All great man dazzle and they blind us; all great men have wide vision and they narrow our own, all greatmen have aspirations and they combineours. But this should not be reason enough to miss the reference and context of things. The Gandhian tool, strategy, philosophy and all were directed ta awaken the country and liberate her. That achieved, we have to take only a historical interest in it, We know about "Brahmastra". It could be used only once the gods who bastowed this blessing also made it conditional. It may be a myth, but in a generalised from it is more than a myth.

Born leaders have always devised special mechanism for solving specific problems once the problem is solved, the mechanism has to be placed in the museum of history.

Let us remember that greatmen come and go like meteors. In complete darkness and confusion, they illuminate the paths. chase away the darkness, but afterwards we have to depend on our own stars, moon and sun and to light our own candles.

Do not belittle Gandhi's devices. He gave a platinum sickle– it was meant for cutting the chains of a slave country, do not misuse it for cutting grass and hay. We have seen, the use or misuse of "Fast Unto Death" has resulted in carving out a new state of Andhara. The Doctrine of Passive Resistence brought to its logical conclusion means complete anarchy and break down of Democracy. The idealist ,General will' of Jeam Jaques Rousseau, which translated into practical language of democracy mean a "Majority Rule" evaporates and what remains is "all minority opinions" coercing for their own Rule. (I am fully conscious of the other horn of the dilemma that the philosophical extention of "General will" if given a bit of misconstruction may result in Hitlers and Mussolinies). The logical conclusion of

Gandhian Economics means a life of drudgery, poverty, want, starvation and famine.

Gandhi did not get the lake for salt, because he liked salt very much, He, who lived on goat milk had not much use for salt, any way. He lived in the lake to know how deep the British strength was. He came out with salt not to taste it but to test the power of the Empire and the courage of the contrymen.

An agitation against the sales tax, may be good imitation or certainly mesappropriation of a specific tool devised for a specific purpose, which you have failed to grasp. Don't imitate his Charkha and spinning since your vision is limited and you don't see that the thread which he span then while binding the nation in one, chained Ladcashire and Manchester and supplied ropes to hang His Majesty the King of seven seas, but now they will strangle your industries and throttle your economic growth. This man who spins has tight lips. You cannot trace a faint line of smile. But remember this master strategist was so superb at this job, that he left the whole world wondering for all times to come as to whether he was a saint or a politician. This wizard saint political strategist gave all he had to one cause and one purpose it was the liberation of the motherland. With undivided attention he devoted all his philosophical capabilities in that direction, all his legal acumen to that purpose, and his total energy for its achievements. The international amplifications are only logical extentions of the Gandhian system, which are void of any practical utility. Don't try to solve modern problems with what he supplied,

Gandhian Economics is nothing but a bundle of absurdities. There cannot be anythig like a self-sufficient village. It must depend for salt on some other place. Iron goods, cement, fruits which the village can not produce because of climatic conditions, she must take from the outside world and must give her own to the outside world. The Law of comparative advantage is an atom-bomb which may be used against any such economic system, even if he self sufficiency of a village be advocated in the relative sense. Division of labour and international division of labour cannot be disspensed with.

A cottage industry economy would doom the nation to perpetual backwardness. Cottage industries. do solve the problem of unemployment in the short run, but by reducing the GNP they subsequently

lower down income and hence total consumption expenditure and investment expenditure and ultimately the employment level of the nation. I leave aside the effect on standard of living, since in the Gandhian Model, it is taken as a constant not a variable 'Plan living' is the motto.

The Gandhian theory of population is outdated, since Gandhi preached 'moral restraint' as Malthus had done as a preacher but later recanted as a Scientist. But Gandhi remained and idealist, nd an idealist could not be a realist.

In ultimate analysis, Gandhian economics will fail to solve modern economic problems.

It has been rightly remarked that if you sit on the lid of progress, ou will be blown up. The pace of progress con not be and should be owed down.

One who has never hero-worshipped God, leave aside mortals, ill be with you to hero-worship Gandhi provided you do so in the oper context and in right proportions. Don't forget that the man d failed at times but raised himself above others by calling his own istake a "Himalayan Blunder."

I am fully aware that I make a very unconventional remark ich has not been made uptil now, more so, from a plat-rm like this, but while accepting the invitation to participate I had de it conditional, on my freedom to criticise and the organiser r. Ramji Singh who has more of Gandhian spirit than many of ndhi's desciples, gave me more than I asked for on a retaliatory ndition that I was to be brief and pointed. I have fulfilled at least ty per-cent of the condition.

DISCUSSION

Dr. K. N. Tiwari :—Please explain standard of living in the concept of Gandhian economics.

Dr. S. N. Thakur :—That even if standard of living went down Gandhi had nothing to complain about or whatever he had there is no proof of his writings on that score. I may say that because of his philosophy of plain living, it was not in the system, that we should increase our standard of living. In other system we are within twentieth century tools and rather post-ancient tools for solving our problems, where we have also to accept that the standard of living should go on. I mean, there should be increase in the standard of living. This is what I meant when I said that it was constant. No, it will go down.

Dr. K. N. Tiwari :—One thing more. In what sense, do you talk self-sufficiency ?

Dr. S. N. Thakur :—That is why I have said that also in the relative sense. I have used sometimes symbolic language when I said comparative cost. That it represents everything that you want to say. That means that self-sufficiency also in the relative sense. That is to say, if you do not take this thing or do not take that thing, because Gandhi was very clear on that point. He did not draw a line of demarcation, what things to be producca in the villages, what things to be imported from outside the village. Talking about the national economy and international economy, our machine is very superfine, the law of comparative cost or the law of relative advantage. Now with that machinery tackle the problem and the Gandhian explanation evaporates altogether.

Dr. Ramji Singh :-You have given the picture of modern economic conditions of India, but how you would solve the problem of unemployment and under-employment from other than Gandhian method ?

Dr. S. N. Thakur :—The same question has been raised in America before Americans, rather at the advent of American industrialisation, and the whole world wonders that America used machines and superior technology and the demand for labourers has gone up, because that increases national income. That means more need for commodities, more demand, consequently more industries and that

way it takes care of itself. When I say it takes care of itself, I mean to say that there is the self-adjusting mechanism. It works, wonderfully well and the whole problem is solved of itself. For unemplayment if you just go and accept cottage industries or this or that, then in that case, in your system, employment has become a variable, not production. Let us not care for employment what we ought to care for is production, If you take care of production, well, we shall distribute leisure, as in the University we have distributed leisure. More of leisure, less of work.

Dr. Ramji Singh :—Modern technology implies mechanisation and automation and if you mean industrialisation seriously, you have just heard Dhiren Bhai that hardly a few hundred people will be required for meeting our requirements. Then you will have abundance of leisures, so much so that one man will break the head of other, because an empty mind is devil's workshop.

Dr. S. N. Thakur :—Dr. Ramji Singh, I will say that our values differ. Most respectfully I will differ also from Sri Mazumdar. We stand at two poles, Whenever there will be hundred men working for the whole nation, then let me tell you, these hundred men will lead in such a manner that all the people of the nation will be employed. There is no doubt about it. There has been more and more of automation in the United States of America and it is said about American women that they breed like rabbits, an American Professor Stoneclok said so. Now the population has gone up increasing in America at a very fast rate. Even then there is no problem of unemployment in the sense in which we have or others have. The more under-developed economy, the greater the unemployment there would be. This is my conviction and I will be apologetic for my conviction, we may differ on this issue.

Dr. Ramjee Singh :—I think, Prof. Thakur has shifted from Economics to culture. I will give just one instance of Soviet Russia. Now the present tendency in modern Soviet educational world, is that they want to put more work. Mackrenko, who wrote books on education, find that education has less work. So physical work is not only for anything else, but even for the required combined equilibrium or self-development, because man is not only mental, he is also physical. So, you must give him both. You may say that you will have ample of *sports* for physical culture. It means, exert physically but it will be an unproductive labour, May I ask, is it a rational approach ? Is this

the economics of man ? Is not man in the 'forefront' and wealth in the 'background' in a scientific economic system ? Even as humanist, will you not accept that man is the measure of everything including the type of economic growth ?

Dr. S. N. Thakur :—I do not take it as a question, hence I think, I have not to reply.

Dr. Kedar Ram Gupta :—But is it not a fact that human labour is cheaper in India ?

Dr. S. N. Thakur :—The taste of civilisation is that men are cheaper and not dearer. Unless you adopt such process, well, in India and also in all backward countries it will continue to be cheaper and machines dearer.

Dr. N. Jha. —I agree that no economy is completely valid for all the times. It is not only true of Mahatma Gandhi, it is true of Marshall, Pikard and all others. Portions from one economist's writing are valid and made use of in subsequent times for short periods but his validity, afterwords is time barred. As a matter of fact, the success of economy depends on, how suitable it is in the context, in which he is writing. There are some hidden suitabilities in the context. Nobody should claim that Gandhi's economy is valid for all times. A part of it was bound, to a great extent to an immediate solution also and the assumptions were in his mind and the moment the assumptions differ and the times change, some amount of validity would go. So there should not be an implied acceptance of Mahatma Gandhi, as an immediate cure for all of economists. But it is also quite true to say that a country so populous as India is, and when the population is growing at the double rate, the problem of employment in rural areas which is mighty problem, is quite embarassing. No amount of industrialisation on modern lines, on the earth, is their solution. And something has to be done, more or less, on Gandhian lines. The Government have themselves accepted some elements of Gandhian economics for their purpose. They accepted cottage industries, they have given some place to cottage industries in small scale industries, in the industrialisation. Also Semertan and Fersion say that in a double economy there should not be industries based only on modern technology. That means more and more of technologies more and more of cottage industries. They should co-exist. Co-existence of differnt kinds of

technologies are now accepted by modern economists, like Fersion. The simple reason is that there is not enough capital to switch over the modern techonology. And you would not be able to give employment also. It is possible now in the 20th century, by state action to so limit the hours of work that both these technologies might co-exist side by side. In the 19th century, this modern industry could not compete with the large scale industry, besause their markets over-lapped. But with some amount of state action and by dividing the areas and markets, this over-lapping can be stopped. So. less developed technology could work in certain areas of its own and the modern technology could function in other areas. So this is one way in which you can see the Gandhian ideas of arm-fencing. Of course, this is not Gandhian theory, but modern theories are more civilising Gandhiji said that the use of machines should only be made if there is welfare for all. That is, welfare economics, you see. He was not against the use of machines. He said machines should be used if it in conflict with the welfare of all. That is all. I think every body will agree that if there is loss of welfare in the use of machine. then it should be used up to a limit. Gandhiji could not prohibit to use the machine. He did not say that there should not be foreign trade. He did accept that whatever would be needed by the nation and could not be grown by the nation, should be accepted from outside. He was not against the import and export of food and cloths from outside. I think, the emphasis, which he laid on the textile industry or the production of textile, which was the most important import of India at that time. and most important export to Britain. Even economically he emphasised on foreign production of cotton and at the same time by emphasising Swadeshi. But he would have accepted these things as parts of our programme, that there should be national self-sufficiency in food and in clothing. In these two most essential supplys, a nation must be self-sufficient.

Sri. S. N. Thakur :—Dr. Rai has taken a scientific approach, but have you heard about Sri Jai Prakash Narayan's Programme that whenever there are differences of opinions, there should be a lotery. What have you to say to that, because Jai Prakash Narayan is also an intellectual descendent of Mahatma Gandhi and wherever he was left it, probably he is carrying it forward.

Dr. H. Rai : I am not agreeable to this lotery system. I do not

agree to this kind of lotery system. It is not a rational approach, say the least, to leave things to chance. I do not think it wise, i. e. the lotery system.

Sri Govind Rao Deshpande : – Is there any alternative for that? We have majority rule all over the country. We have come to increase the majority principle from .51 per cent to 75 per cent and in the Security Council 100 per cent.

Dr. H. Rai : – It is not that all legislative enactments reflect only one set of opinion. Even Bataidari Law which was set in motion by a Communist Minister had to undergo tremendous amendments and then perhaps it was accepted by the 95 per cent of the people though they would not say so, because it was moved by a Communist man. Had it been initiated by some body else, other than Communist man, perhaps a large number of people would have gladly hailed that agitation. So what I feel, is that democracy impliss discussion and discussion always believes two parties. If there are two parties, of course, there will always be exchange of views, which leads to the meeting of minds; and it further leads to some kind of compromise. What is important in a democracy is that we should learn to compromise, i. e. compromise in principle. It means give and take; it means also acceptance of the views of the opponent and giving credit to their views. This thing functions in Britain very well, and perhaps it can function in India also, if we are in a position to preserve our democratic institutions, say for a period of 20 years, 25 years, 30 years. I am pretty sure, that there is no alternative to majority rule. The only alternative is one man's rule.

I feel, Gandhiji's political ideas are philosophic protest.

The principle of unanimity goes against principle of moral conscience. If every body has the inner voice which is part of Brahma, then his voice is as good perhaps as the voice of 99 per cent.

Dr. Ramji Singh : – But what is the remedy a corrupt tyrany of majority Rule? The U. N. Security Council in accepting the principle of unanimity, has taken notice of this. And of the principle of unanimity can be applied on international level, it can be practiced at lower levels also,

Dr. H. Rai :-This principle might be applied. It is being applied at international level at great cost.

Sri K. N. Tiwari :-This I can just verify that unanimity principle was adopted by the League of Nations, but in the United Nation, the General Assembly, has now adopted 2/3 Majority Principle and in the Security Council, only the unanimity of big powers is required, and not unanimity of the whole.

Dr. H. Rai :—This principle of unanimity in found working even in Legislative or in the executive bedin.

Dr. Ramji Singh :—In modern times there is a tendency to break away from this trend of accepted Majority Rule, and there are different kinds of things, like consensus etc, so I think there is a drift, and this drift is towards that principle of unanimity. Of course, you can say that it may not be practicable always.

Dr. H. Rai :-No Sir, that is practicable also. What happens in the Legislature ? In the legislature, we know the sense of the House The Speaker says 'yes'. The House says 'yes', because many people says 'yes'. No body is going to challenge that. But some times, people might challenge it and then we have to accept that challenge.

Sri S. N. Thakur :-If there is anything like unanimity in the U. N. O., that is at a great cost.

Sri S. S. Chakravarty :—I am afraid, we are under wrong understanding. Unanimity is there among the big five powers. If you accept the unanimity principle in political life also, that would be leading to the granting of veto power to the individual.

Sri K. N. Tewari :—Majority system is definitely an improvement, Even in international sphere, I find that in the League of Nations, it was unanimity principle, which was adopted first and then the United Nation just shifted over to the Majority Principle. Besides that I would also like to add that majority is also not a static thing. The majority interprets not the majority will, but the will of the entire community. And it is only in this context that majority seems to be correct. Objectively speaking, or thinking, the majority may also change and just another set of majority may spring up on some other issues. So the majority does not mean the voice of the majority, or the will of the majority, but it is the will of the community as inter-

preted by the majority. Besides, this consensus system was experimented in Indonesia in the name of Guided Democracy. This task was entrusted to particularly old experienced men and other different persons and they got consensus of the House. But this system did not work. This very system was again experimented in Pakistan under the Presidentship of General Ayub. There also it is unsuccessful.

Sri S. N. Thakur :—We can not estimate the merit of Gandhian Polity without its proper context.

Dr. Ramji Singh : - Yes. we want to judge the merit of the principle of unanimity under the present circumstances. Gandhi talks of oceanic circle, decentralised democracy, and self-sufficient village republics and in that background, I think most of our objections are simply theoretical. Well, just for information may I tell you that in the Vinoba's scheme, Bhudan land is distributed to the villagers on the principle of unanimity. We can tell you with sincerity that out of 100 per cent, 99. 9 per cent cases have been decided on the principle of unanimity. So, I think we are discussing this problem just out of this background. I think. if we can take all these things into consideration, it may be more acceptable.

———

Haridwar Rai, M. A., Ph.D.
Head of the Department of Political Science,
Bhagalpur University.

PHILOSOPHY AND GOVERNMENT OF GRASS-ROOTS : A CRITIQUE OF THE GANDHIAN POLITY

As philosophical anarchist in his views, Gandhi, on more than one occasion, described his ideal society as the stateless society and referred to 'political power as not an end but one of the means of enabling people to better their condition in every department of life.'[1] His philosophical anarchism has two basic elements : (a) his profound faith in the moral freedom of man as an integral part of body social and (b) his deep-seated belief in the doctrine of non-violence or universal love. For one thing, his ideal non-violent state involves a contradiction in terms, because the state as such is organised, concentrated violence. It is physical force that gives the state its distinctive characther. In contrast, the ideal society of Gandhi's conception is the society of enlightened anarchy, where social life has become so perfect as to be self-regulated and co-operative. In his ideal state, therefore, everyone is his own ruler, there being no political power and ultimately no state. Thus, a stateless society alone can be a completely non-violent society. That society is perfect and non-violent, he once said 'where the people are governed the least. The nearest approach to purest anarchy would be a democracy based on non-violence.'[2]

There are two aspects of the Gandhian polity—the ideal and the practical. On the one hand, he enunciates an ideal which may serve as 'the eternal beacon light to distracted humanity', on the other, he condescends to the practical and declares his living faith in a modified ideal while upholding the ultimate ideal of philosophical anarchism. His ideal society based on total non-violence is not capable of immediate realisation. It will come into being when all people become completely non-violent. But true non-violence must come from within. It must be a natural and spontaneous evolution and must be the outcome of the individual's own efforts and enlightenment. This process of transformation must be evolutionary and hence gradual

1. *Young India*, 2. 7. 1932.

2. *Harijan*, 21. 7. 1940.

rather than revolutionary and hence sudden. 'A Government' he conceded 'cannot succeed in becoming entirely non-violent because it represents all the people. I do not today conceive of such a golden age. But I do believe in the possibility of a predominantly non-violent society.'[3]

Such being the case, Gandhi, the realist, set before the world as the immediate attainable ideal 'the predominantly non-violent state' or the state that governs the least. His ultimate ideal remains the moral rule of each individual over himself, though, for practical purposes, his ideal society is to be identified with Thoreau's ideal of the Government that governs the least.[4] He compares his ideal to Euclid's point or line. 'Euclid's line is one without breadth but no one has so far been able to draw it and never will. All ihe same, it is only by keeping the ideal line in mind that we have made progress in Geometry. What is true here is true of every ideal.'[5] His second-best state would be a non-violent, decentralised democracy based on the principle of equal moral worth of all human beings, providing equal opportunities to all and gradually advancing towards Gandhi's ultimate social ideal to the best of its capacity.[6] Centralisation stands for violence and exploitation and is antithetical to the moral worth of the individual.

His opposition to the state stems largely from certain ethical, spiritual and religious considerations. 'As a philosopher of history and culture, Gandhi is a believer in spiritual ideational determinism which follows from his belief in the reign of God in the cosmos.'[7] To him duty to one's conscience and loyalty to God are above the dictates of the state. This implies individual moral freedom which alone can enable a man to surrender himself completely to the service of society. Accordingly, Gandhi considers the state as incapable of doing any service to morality and refuses to consider any action done under pressure or compulsion as moral. His attack upon the principle of majority rule emanates from his conception of the moral individual.

3. Quoted in G. N. Dhawan, *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*, (Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1946), p. 291.
4. *Young India*, 29. 1. 1925.
5. *Harijan*, 15. 9. 1946. See also Harijan, 28. 7. 1946.
6. G. N. Dhawan, "Individual and Society", *Politics of Persuasion*, eds., K. P. Mishra and R. Avasthi, (Bombay, Manaktalas, 1967), p. 294.
7. V. P. Varma; The Philosophical and Sociological Foundations of Gandhism" *Gandhian Concept of State*, ed., B. B. Majumdar, (Catcutta, M. C. Sankar and Sons, 1957), p. 63.

'Swaraj' he onoe wrote 'will be an absurdity if individuals have to surrender their judgement to a majority.'[8]

II

Politically and economically, the Gandhian polity will be completely decentralised. Decentralisation and small-scale communities are the logical adjuncts of the non-violent polity, for 'centralisation cannot be sustained and defended without adequate force.' He champions decentralisation because that is 'the logical corrollary of those values and maxims-he calls them vows-which are implicit in non-violence and the knowledge and steadfast pursuit of which helps in knowing life and living.'[9] Gandhi is convinced that 'the small communities can certainly act as forces for the stabilisation of personality by creating a nucleus of organic socio-psychological density. Big urban establishment generate a sense of anomie and anonymity. In intense civic and social participation is possible. Furthermore, only in small groups can there be scope for love, affection and organic solidarity.'[10]

The village will be the key-unit of the Gandhian social and economic order and it will be self-sufficient, self-sustained and autonomous. It will be capable of managing its own affairs itself, even to the extent of defending itself against the world. 'This does not exclude dependence on and willing help from neighbours or from the world. It will be free and voluntary play of mutual forces.' The same principle of love and *ahimsa*, which is relied upon to maintain order and peace as between individuals is relied upon to maintain inter-village harmony: "In this structure composed of innumerable villages there will be ever-widening, never-ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individual always ready to perish for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages till at least the whole becomes one life composed of individuals never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majesty of oceanic

8. *Young India*, 8. 12. 1921.

9. G. N. Dhawan, "Individual and Society," *op. cit.*, p. 297.

10. V. P. Verma, *op. cit.*, pp. 79–80.

circle of which they are integral units."[11] In this structure of decentralised polity, 'the outermost circumference will not wield power to crush the inner circle but give strength to all within and derive its own from the centre. If there ever is to be a republic of every village in India, then I claim verity for my picture in which the last is equal to the first, or in other words, none is to be the first and none the last.[12]

The nearest approximation to the village republics of his conception were the ancient Indian village communities, What attracted him most towards these ancient communes were their corporate community life, smallness of their size, their self-governing character and their self-sufficiency. Every activity in Gandhi's village republic will be conducted, as far as possible, on cooperative basis. 'There will be no room for machines that would displace human labour and that would concentrate powers in a few hands.' Non-violence with its technique of *satyagraha* and non-cooperation will be the sanction of the village community. The village *panchayat* will be responsible for meeting the primary needs of the community—the needs of food, clothing. shelter, medical care and education The village community will be completely autonomous, self-regulating and self-determining in its internal matters and the *panchayat* will be entirely subservient to it.

But the village community will not be able to tackle bigger problems like higher education, bigger industries, larger irrigation projects, etc. And, therefore, a group of villages will come together and pool their resources in order to manage their matters of common interest. A group of the units of the second tier of this decentralised structure will combine together to tackle such tasks as running a still higher educational institution, a research centre, a major irrigation and power project, an electric and other key industrial plants and the like. The fifth or sixth tier of this polity will form the national *panchayat* and later in fullness of time, the next tier, the biggest oceanic circle, will encompass the whole world, Each unit will be absolutely free and unfettered in the exercise of powers and functions delegated to it by *the next* lower unit and the main function of each unit above the primary will be to bring about coordination between various depart-

11. *Harijan*, 28.7.1946. See also M. K. Gandhi, *Panchayat Raj*, (Ahmedabad, Navjivan Publishing House, 1959), pp. 8–10,

12. *Ibid*,

ments of the lower units, in addition to their own specific functions assigned to them by the lower units.

In this kind of a decentralised sarvodaya democracy, since the higher units are constituted of the representatives of lower units, actual power will be exercised from the bottom upwards. The higher, narrower storeys will be woven into the lower, broader storeys and the whole upper structure will be effectively architectured into the foundation. It will resemble a broad based pyramid with tapering apex as against the unstable democracies which are like an inverted pyramid, a pyramid standing on its head whose equilibrium is always in danger of being disturbed. The problem is 'part of the larger problem of social reconstruction' —–'to recreate the human community' as Jayaprakash Narayan would put it.[13] This social reconstruction will be founded in a rural cooperative society and the village community and the individual will tend to be the basic unit of this polity.

III

The Gandhian conception of decentralised polity may be said to symbolise his philosophy of protest against the present day statism, industrialism and over-centralisation of political and economic power. The Gandhians and Sarvodaya ideologues are accustomed to thinking of dispersal and decentralisation of power and of small rural communities as good in themselves and as more conducive to liberty than centralisation which is painted as an evil. Such homilies as 'rural republics', 'grass-roots goverument' and 'villagisation' are intended to underline the importance of traditionally sheltered, autonomous villages, largely free from the unsetting effect of modern science and technology. But this concept embodies some dubious propositions. It signifies a rural, not an urban, static not a dynamic, conception of democracy.[14] It identifies decentralisation and small communities with democracy itself. It suggests that political opinion is formed by inter-personal dialogue and presupposes that politlcal action begins from below

13. Jayprakash Narayan is one of the foremost exponents of the Gandhian decentralised polity and his views find full expression in his penetrating work "A Plea for the Reconstruction of the Indian Polity," *Socialism, Sarvodaya and Democracy*, ed., Bimla Prasad, (Asia Publishing House, 1964), pp. 192–238.

14. Hugh Tinker observes that 'the total emphasis on community means an emphasis on all the static, reactionary elements in India ' see "Tradition and Experiment in Forms of Government", *Politics and Society in India*, ed., C. H. Philips, (London, George Allen and Unwin, 1963), p. 181.

rather than stimulated from above, It prefers spontaneous community opinion to the dialectic of large-scale institutions. But do these not conflict with democracy itself ?[15] It is pertinently argued that 'democracy is by definition broad in view, equalitarian, majoritarian, unitarian, it emphasises the social whole, avoiding the atomisation which follows the interposition of any intermediary between the state and the individual. Local government, on the other hand, is a phenomenon of differentiation and individualisation.. Democracy and local government are therefore in an important sense anti-thetical.'[16]

Two of the most distinguished political philosophers who have discussed the issue of what decentralisation and small communities contribute to democracy were de Tocqueville and John Stuart Mill. Both argued strongly that decentralisa tion of political power was a necessary component of democracy. They stated the theses that: (a) decentralisation and small-scale units of government gave access to government; (2) that it associated the citizen with each other and with the process of government of which they were in part authors, (3) that local government broadencd popular participation and fostered public virtue in the participants and energy in the people; and (4) that decentralisation contributed to independence and liberty.[17]

But this argument is qualified in the actual political process. As a rule, the importance of small communities in respect of providing access to administration and politics has declined and other channels

15. Paul H. Appleby puts porth his thesis that 'the democratic nation comes first, that democracy seeps down from above rather than being imposed from below.' He further maintains that "responsibility upward is essential to the continuing effectiveness of responsibility downward; unless the general interest is well-served, the particular interest will have a diminishing chance of being well-served. Without responsibility and accountability upward those drives become dominant which Thomas Jefferson called 'local egoisms', and which in India are called expressions of communalism." See "Some Thoughts on Decentralised Democracy", *The Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. VIII, No. 4, 1962, p. 417.

16. See Roscoe C. Martin, *Grass Roots*, (University of Albama Press, 1957), p. 43. In this connection, the statement of Georges Langrod is worth quoting: " the incompatibility of democratic principle with practice of decentralisation is a phenomenon so evident that it may be considered as a kind of sociological law." See "Local Government and Democracy," *Public Administration*, Vol. XXXI, 1953, pp. 25-34.

17 De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Vol. I (New York, Knopf, 1945), chs. 14 and 16 and John Stuart Mill, *Considerations on Representative Government*, (New York, Dutton, 1906), ch. 15.

for political expression have come to the fore. For one thing, pressure groups, economic associations and political parties or administrative boards may be both more accessible and more effective for the average citizen to get something from government. A rural community in India can easily become the political preserve of those people so situated that they can and do cooperate as a closed corporation. A restricted group of politicians belonging to the dominant caste or the dominant political party may convert local politics into the monopoly of a private club. Further, in small communities, people know one another very closely—the enemy is often both a personal and political enemy. Hence, recreating a polity and building up social harmony and political cooperation by revitalising the grass roots is a programme to be approached cautiously, if at all.[18] The argument that local communities foster civic virtue and morality is also subject to serious qualifications. It is found that heavy involvement in local affairs can hinder this kind of virtue by detracting from national citizenship itself. The habits and attitudes that suit the one activity often do not suit the other. What is political virtue in the local context becomes parochialism on the national stage.[19]

The proposition that decentralisation promotes liberty is also questionable. Liberty presupposes a general structure of rights–generally enforced and common to all. These aspects of rights are often lost in making government highly responsive to local power structures.[20] 'The marriage betweeh little government and democracy'

---

18. Paul H. Appleby suggests with prophetic accuracy that 'what is done in the communities be not unduly exaggerated, be not misunderstood as constituting some transcendent ktnd of democratic achievement. In the long run, as India succeeds, the nature of an advancing, oomplicating civilisation will require the transfer of a large part of this community activity into governmental bureaucracies with technical competence in knowledge and technical materials which will produce enormously more per man-hour." See *op. cit.*, p. 449.

19. Roscope C. Martin has stated : "The citizen so schooled in local government may develop a keen sense for sectional and special interests, but except by accident he will not graduate with a perceptive grasp of government in any broad or meaningful sense." See *op. cit.*, p. 59.

    Paul H. Appleby also maintains : "Only very resourceful organised efforts on a great scale will be capable of providing sufficiently fruitful ways to enlist and stimulate the abilities of responsible citizens in the decades ahead." See *op. cit.*, p 450.

20. "Village democracies" to quote Henry Maddick "are likely to be subject, in a microscopic way, to the same sort of pressures as any larger society. Decision

remarks Martin thus becomes a device, though sometimes an unconscious one, by which the rural "fortress of anachronistic privileges" is defended in terms of principles dear to the nation."[21] Larger areas with general functions, on the contrary, provide opportunity for one special interest group to be checked by another, just because of the diversity of interests represented in such an area. Besides, the larger political unit has a net advantage in the matter of formality. While formalism may lead to the ills of bureaucracy, it is one of the major means for ensuring that all interests will be fairly heard and their claims treated rationally. Small units of government tend almost inevitably to slip into an informality of operation that constitutes a threat to many of the democratic virtues.

Gandhi's asumption regarding the coercive character of the state and government may also be disputed. He looks upon the state and government as an artificial product imposed on society and carrying out its policies by force and coercion. It may be stated. however, that state emerged historically to organise some basic services in response to universal needs—to glve protection, maintain order, administer justice and welfare. It follows then that wherever such activities are organised, there the political process is at work and the seeds of the state are sown. In the present age, the same tendencies that ushered in the nation-state are operating again to provide it with a successor. For ensuring security and prosperity, our present units are too small to be effective. Therefore, despite protestation to the contrary, we are

by consensus of folk democracy appears very democratic on the surface, but when analysed, as to who may discuss the issues, who dare advance variant opinions, and whose opinion earries weight. then this democracy looks perhaps less pure than at first sight. It very often incorporates authoritarian aspects of the social hierarchy as, for instance, may be found in many Indian villages." See *Democracy, Decentralisation and Development*, (Asia Publishing House, 1963), p. 70.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 43. In this connection the observation of Leslie Lipson may be quoted : "People have often sought the aid of a distant protector to defend them from a nearby oppressor. The local bully–whether landowner captain of industry or political boss cannot in all cases be opposed by the people of the locality where he dominates. If they are to be freed, he must be overwhelmed by some greater power from outside." See *The Great Issues of Politics* (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965), p. 295. It is further stated in this connection that "in nine-tenths of the couuties in the United States public affairs are in the hands of what the irreverent call 'the court-house gang' a more or less permanent group of elective and appointive office-holders together with private individuals whose business normally brings them into contact with public officials." See Alfred de Grazia, *Political Organisation*, (New York, Free Press, 1962), pp. 222-23.

turning for salvation not to national power alone, but to international arrangements; not to sovereignty but to alliances, federations and mutual commitments; not to the exclusive interest of a single state but to the community of regional interests. Many of the most urgent problems of our age can only be solved on a scale of territory and population far larger than even the greatest of Nations now contains.

But all these qualifications and criticisms of the Gandhian conception of polity should not suggest that his views are completely without relevance to-day. Decentralisation and local communities still form a vital element of democratic government, and their importance is demonstrated most clearly when one contemplates the situation as it is or would be without them. For one thing, they can share a sizeable portion of the responsibility of the central government and its field administration and can act as instruments of political socialisation. The modern society requires the continuous leavening of political activists who are not merely party or interest-group members. This need is not adequately met by central or state governments alone, or even by the 'plural society.' It is local democracy which gives many people a voice in matters touching them most immediately and affords them an opportunity to exert political influence through their local political leaders. A vigorous local community can doubtless be an invaluable socio-political laboratory for trying and testing on a small scale various new proposals for government organisation and will be an effective counterblast to a dead uniformity in all standards, policies and organisation imposed on all local areas by an ever-expanding national government.



Dr. Krishna Mohan Prasad.
Department of Political Science,
Bhagalpur University.

ETERNAL RELEVANCE OF SATYAGRAHA

We are living in an age of mounting tensions—tensions between man and man, class and class, nation and nation. The world today, as never before, stands uneasily poised on the brink of total destruction under the menace of nuclear weapons and guided missiles. Science has given man almost unlimited control over nature, but it has not taught him how to control and refine his own nature. It is, as Jung put it, as if a little boy of six were given dynamite amongst his birth-day presents. He asks : "how can we save the child from the dynamite that nobody can take away from him ? The good spirit of humanity is challenged as never before It is now a question of existence or non-existence."[1]

Now the problem confronting the conscientious minds all over the world is how to resolve these multilateral tensions, conflicts, violence and war. When physical force is used to settle a problem, it sets in motion an opposite force of a like character. This in turn necessitates the use of greater force, that is, greater violence, and so the chain of violence and counter-violence lengthens and strengthens. To cite one example, the professed end of Communism is creation of a stateless, classless society in which freedom and equality reign supreme and from which all violence is altogether eliminated. This is exactly the ultimate aim of the Gandhian concept of *sarvodaya*. But since Communists sought to achieve this end by violent means, the result is mass coercion and mass violence on a staggering scale and the state, far from tending to wither away, has become more entrenched, more authoritarian and more totalitarian than ever before. Gandhiji, therefore, showed an absolutely different technique of social revolution and of the resolution of all conflicts. This is the non-violent method of *satyagraha*.

According to Gandhiji: the law of *satyagraha*, that is, the law of love works, just as the law of gravitation works whether we are conscious of it or not." Just as a scientist works wonders out of various applications of the law of nature, even so a man who applied the law of love with scientific precision can work greater wonders. For the force

1. C. G. Jung : *Essays on Contemporary Events*, London, 1947, p. 90.

of non-violence is infinitely more wonderful and subtle than the material forces of nature. This brings us to a consideration of the operation of the law of love or non-violence by individuals and groups in conflict-situations.

In case of a violent resistance to a violent attack, the violent response by the victim makes the attacker sure of his opponent's scale of moral values, of his own choice of methods and of the way in which the victim is to react. This strengthens the attacker's morale. But if he is resisted non-violently, that is, if the victim suffers the assailant's violence patiently, cheerfully, fearlessly, and without ill-will, while at the same time stating his belief as to the truth of the matter in dispute and his own sincerity to it, its effect would be altogether different on the assailant. The *satyagrahi's* courage of conviction and his unflinching endurance of pain startle the assailant. Such an unusual and unexpected spectacle fills the assailant with wonder. The novelty of the situation created by voluntary suffering, without the least resentment or retaliation plunges the assailant into a new world of values. Thus far he had met only violent resistance to his own violence and he knew well how to deal with such resistance. But this unique kind of resistance nonpluses him. He does not know how to handle it. He loses his self-confidence and moral balance whereas the *satyagrahi's* zeal and passion for his high ideal sustain his moral balance; nay, it is strengthened by self-suffering.

The non-violence and good–will of the *satyagrahi*, in spite of the sufferings inflicted by his assailant, arouses the latter's higher instincts and puts them against his own baser instincts. He begins to realize the difference between his own brutal behaviour and the non-violent response of the *satyagrahi*. He also realizes that he is losing prestige and public support. He feels a loss of self-respect and gets a sense of inferiority and realizes the inner strength, bravery and superiority of the non-violent resister. The surpassing conduct and attitude of the *satyagrahi* towards the assailant's violence get upon his subconscious and imagination and he happens to be in a highly suggestible and receptible state of mind and emotion. But the non-violent resister continues to be on superior and more advantageous position and in a less suggestible condition because whereas his conduct is altogether new, unexpected and unpredictable to the assailant who is habituated only to violence, he is himself not confronted with anything unusual and surprising. For him everything goes according to plan, but for

the bewitched and nonplussed assailant every moment is a trying situation. The *satyagrahi* has still another element of superior power : his self-control and lack of anger conserves his energy. In addition to these, his demonstration of immense sincerity to his cause and his indomitable spirit, coupled with the vast reservoir of energy, profoundly impress the assailant and create emotion in him. The *satyagrahi* has now succeeded in sufficiently arousing the assailant's suggestibility which brings about a change in the latter's inner attitude.

The new ideas in the astonishing situation created by the *satyagrahi* tend strongly to stimulate the assailant's imagination which, in conjunction with suggestion, becomes much stronger than conscious will-power. The sight of a person voluntarily suffering for an ideal moves the assailant and the onlookers and the *satyagrahi* wins public sympathy and support and also his assailant's respect. The assailant now begins unconsciously to imitate him and thus his anger tends to subside. By means of non-violent resistance, the *satyagrahi* also seeks to communicate feelings and ideas to the violent opponent. Thus there is both an emotional and an intellectual element to be transmitted. Since the ideas to be conveyed are unusual, the understanding of them by the assailant may be slow and at first more emotional than intellectual. But the *satyagrahi* has to exercise utmost patience untill his violent opponent comes to realize the justness of his cause. Any haste would mar the very purpose of *satyagrahi*. Another unconscious process at work is the trust evinced by the *satyagrahi*. He tries to give repeated evidences of his trust in the decency and reasonableness of his violent adversary even if the latter deceives him several times. Trust acts subtly, but all the more powerfully and creatively on the assailant.

Psychologists hold that the forces, whether of suggestion, imagination, imitation, communication or trust, that operate upon a person's subconscious or trust, than forces that operate upon the conscious mind. The total effect of these processes taking place in the mind and heart of the violent opponent is such that he is converted. Then comes the stage of integration which consists of working out a new solution that seeks so integrate the interests of both the parties on a higher plane. But the conflict is not yet resolved, only its emotional aspect—the fear, anger, hatred, indignation, vanity, contempt, disdain, disgust, anxiety, apprehension etc.—is solved, that is, the divisive emotion of of the assailant in relation to the *satyagrahi* is eliminated. With the

new emotional attitude always present to help over the tight places, the *satyagrahi* would be able to solve the rest of the conflict by keen intellectual exploration in the new atmosphere of mutual good-will, understanding and trust. Now the conflict is finally over and both the parties are satisfied with the solution, none feeling defeat or humiliation, none nursing any grudge or harbouring vengeance. Now permanent peace and harmony prevail, with both the initially conflicting energies working in the same direction. On the other hand superficial peace imposed by violence is quite unstable, for the conflict only being suppressed, it is always in look out for an outlet. The suppressed anger and resentment become hatred waiting for an opportunity for revenge and retaliation. And retailiation provokes counter–retaliation and further violence.

So far we have discussed the working of individual *satyagraha*. Now let us consider the working of mass *satyagraha*.

Morale, discipline and training constitute the main strength of the armies. This is equally true of the non-violent armies. The theory and individual practice of *satyagraha* have long history, but Gandhiji was the first to invent the science of mass *satyagraha* and demonstrate it suceessful. The failures of non-violent resistence in the past have been, therefore, largely due to the lack of discipline and true non-violence as also to the lack of understanding of the full implications of *satyagraha*. Discipline removes most of the effects of individual weaknesses. It is not necessary that every single *satyagrahi* must, from the very beginning, be fully disciplined for non-violence and be fully conversant with the philosophy, science and starategy of *satyagraha* even as it is not necessary for every soldier in an army to be paragon of military virtue. If the leaders have the full understanding, self-control and discipline of *satyagraha*, the rank and file may, at the start, be ordinary men and women.

Now coming to the field of mass *satyagraha*, let us suppose that *satyagrahis* are opposed to a company of soldiers who are using violence and are arresting *satyagrahis*. If the Satyagrahis maintain their discipline and cheerfully bear all sufferings and court arrests, their conduct will, sooner or later, cause surprise in the soldiers and start them thinking and talking about it among themselves. It is said that if the soldiers began to think, not one would remain in the ranks. If the soldier begins to think in the midst of a conflict.

his morale beings to disintegrate. If the cause of the *satyagrahis* is a patent one and if their stand is on a solid truth, a doubt arises in the minds of the soldiers about the validity of their own cause. And when doubt comes, morale crumbles. Again, it is generally held that no man with any scruples of conscience is fit to be a soldier. The soldiers also feel no exhilaration in fighting against non-violent resisters who are voluntarily suffering for a great cause. Trained as they are for action, peaceful *satyagraha* badly affects their morale. As the *satyagraha* proceeds, the officers also begin to realize that it is indecent and undignified to use violence against innocent, non-retaliating people.

Non-violent resistance is not likely to incite firing and air raids, but supposing that *satyagrahis* are tear-gassed, fired upon and bombed so that many are injured and killed. In such a case soldiers do not come in direct contact with *satyagrohis* and their (the former's) morale is not directly weakened, but when the news of such a brutal and cowardly act spreads it produces a strong public indignation against the users of such violence resulting in the fall of their respect. The news of the Jalianwala Bagh massacre, for instance, was a great blow to British respect and prestige all over the world. Besides, the sight of the wounded *satyagrahis* acts on the morale of the beholders like the drops of cold water which imperceptibly wear away the stone. Suffering mobilizes strong public opinion and fosters unity among them which few dare to defy. Again, sooner or later the surviving *satyagrahis* come in contact with their assailants through parleys between *satyagrahi* leaders and leaders of the assailants and get an opportunity to change their morale and attitude. And the break-down of morale is really a change of heart, an act of inner conversion.

It is argued that *satyagraha* can be of no avail if it is used against powers which are impervious to world opinion and unsusceptible to moral appeal. The use of non-violence against such dictatorial powers which are unmoral by definition would mean playing into their hands, they say. Gandhiji's reply to this was that the science of *satyagraha* which is based on non-violence does not depend for its working upon the sufferance of the tyrant. Belief in non-violence is based on the assumption that human nature in essence is one and therefore, unfailingly responds to the advances of love. The hardest metal yields to sufficient the heat; even so must the hardest heart melt before the sufficiency of the heart of non-violence. And there is no limit to the capacity of non-violence to generate heat." "During my half a century

of experience," continued Gandhiji, "I have not yet come across a situation when I had to say that I was helpless, that I had no remedy in terms of non-violence."[2] *satyagraha* touches human nature itself, not only its cultured areas; and human nature, no matter how much violent externally, is at bottom decent. Everybody has in his heart at least a little spark of goodness which can be aroused and strengthened. Nobody is absolutely beyond redemption, not even an Alexander, a Chenghis, a Dyer or a Hitler.

It may be asked, why did non-violence not avail the thousands of Jews and others who perished in Hitler's incinerators and gas chambers ? But did the Jews offer non-violent resistance ? or did they meet their doom with an unuttered curse on their lips and an important passion for revenge in their hearts ? Non-violence of the weak is no doubt bad, but important violence is worse. If *satyagraha* seems to have failed anywhere, it is not due to any inherent ineffectiveness of *satyagraha* but due to lack of true or sufficient non-violence. Gandhiji was firmly of the belief that pure suffering, voluntarily and cheerfully undergone, must melt even the stoniest heart in the end.

On 30th January 1948, just before Gandhiji was taken away from us, Margaret Bourke-White, an American Journalist, asked him how would he meet the atom bomb with non-violence. He replied : "I will not go underground. I will not go into shelters. I will come out in the open and let the pilot see I have not a trace of evil against him. The pilot will not see our faces from his great height, I know. But that longing in our hearts – that he will not come to harm—would reach up to him and his eyes would be opened." The law of 'critical limit' in Physics shows that the normal laws governing the behaviour of matter is reversed after the critical limit is reached. An analogous process, Gandhiji held, would take place in case of the atomic and nuclear weapons which are but the critical phase of destructiveness, which have brought the world on the brink of final, total destruction. He believed that the advent of such weapons would inevitably bring into the field its opposite, i. e. the power of non-violence. And the day mankind learnt to pit it against brute force, the atomic nightmare would disappear like the memory of an ugly dream. Again, such weapons act very like a boomerang. The radioactivity generated by them affects their users as well as those against whom they are used. Besides, the chances of any government using such weapons against own people are little.

2. Quoted in S. Radhakrishnan : *Great Indians*, Bombay, 1956, p. 42.

But now the question arises, what to do if foreign armed inva-ion takes place. According to Gandhiji, the representatives of the eople would let the invaders in without violent opposition, but they vould tell them at the frontier that the people would not at all o-operate with them in any work, neither would they obey any of heir orders, come what may. If the invaders do not halt, people vould offer non-violent resistance unto death to the last man. They vould offer themselves unarmed as fodder for the aggressors' cannons, referring death to submission. The underlying belief of the *satyagrahi* ation is that even a Nero is not devoid of heart. Such a unique, errifying and unexpectable spectacle of endless rows upon rows of men nd women simply diving, rather than surrendering to the will of the aggressor must ultimately melt him and his soldiers.[3] If the aggressors finally come to occupy the country, people would offer non-violent non-co-operation and other forms of *satyagraha* but would never yield willing submission to them. Gandhiji said : "Supposing a people make up their mind that they will never do the tyrant's will, nor retaliate with the tyrant's own methods, the tyrant will not find it worth his while to go on with his terrorism."[4] Tyrants and dictators, he said, "have up to now always found ready response to the violence that they have used. Within their experience, they have not come across organized non-violent resistance on an appreciable scale, if at all. Therefore, it is not only highly likely, but I hold it to be inevitable that they would recognize the superiority of non-violent resistance over any display of violence that they may be capable of putting forth."[5] Thus, according to Gandhiji, non-violent resistance is the best method in all conceivable circumstances."[6]

A scientific testimony as to the superiority of non-violent resistance has been furnished by biologists. They have shown how, even where the law of jungle prevails, it is the meek that inherit the earth. When for instance, two timber—wolves engage in an unhibited fight, the weaker one who is beaten offers undefended the most vulnerable part of his body—the bend of his neck—to his enemy. Describes Mr Lorenz, a great naturalist : "Every second you expect violence and

3. *Harijan*, April 13, 1940.
4. *Harijan*, Dec. 24, 1938.
5. *Harijan*, Dec, 24, 1938.
6. *Ibid.*

await with bated breath the moment when the winner's teeth will rip the jugular vein of the loser. But the victor will definitely not close on his less fortunate rival. You can see that he would like to, but just he cannot : A dog or wolf that offers its neck to its adversary in this way will never be bitten seriously."[7] To quote another example : "If a turkey-cock has had more than his share of the wild and grotesque wrestling-match in which these birds indulge, he lays himself with outstretched neck upon the ground. Whereupon the victor behaves exactly as a wolf or dog in the same situation, that is to say, he evidently wants to peck and kick at the prostrated enemy, but simply can not : he would if he could, but he can't."[8] Whatever may be the reasons that prevent the dominant individual from injuring the submissive one, Lorenz maintains, "whether he is prevented from doing so by a simple and purely mechanical reflex process or by a highly philosophical and moral standard, is immaterial to the practical issue. The essential behaviour of the submissive as well as of the dominant partner remains the same : the humbled creature suddenly seems to lose his objections to being injured and removes all obstacles from the path of the killer, and it would seem that very removal of these outer obstacles raises an insurmountable inner obstruction in the central nervous system of the aggressor."[9] Thus, this natural device of non-resistance that produces powerful inner, resistance, although in human affairs it would be called 'non-violence of the week', enolved for the survival of species, contains a great scientific truth that *not the adoption of deadliest weapons but the shedding of them is the law of human survival.*

---

7. Konrad Z. Lorenz : *King Solomon's Ring*, 1955, pp. 186–87.
8. Konrad Z. Lorenz : *King Solomon's Ring*, 1955, p. 194.
9. *Ibid.* pp. 195–96.

DISCUSSION

Dr. K. N. Tewari :—Gandhian concept of Satyagrah is based on certain assumptions, that man is at bottom good and he can be perfected. Besides, his concept of a Satyagrah of a brave man having idea of good, is talking in absolute term, which I think should be modified in the context of the relative world. It is also sometimes said about Marx that it is not the consciousness which always determines the social conditions, but the social conditions also determine the conciousness in man. Lastly, Mahatma Gandhi's concept of Satyagraph has not shown that he had also a sense of history in the same sense, in which Hegel ane Marx had. And if individuals do not set themselves in tune with the forces of the age, they are sometimes dragged by it. It is not always that individuals can mould things according to their own designs.

Dr. Krisnna Mohan Prasad :—Both these instincts are present in man--self-regarding instinct and other-regarding instinct. Man at the same time is inherently good as well as there may be social conditions particularly economic conditions that may vitiate this good nature of man. So Marx also did not say that man is at bottom bad. He has simply said that man is influenced by the external forces, i. e. external physical conditions and social conditions.

Dr. K. N. Tewari : - He can never be good unless he is forced, because life in the state of nature was nasty, poor, and wild.

Dr. K. M. Prasad :—So Gandhiji also admitted that so long man is in this flesh and blood, he will also continue to be selfish. Only ideally speaking, a man becomes absolutely good. At the time of birth, it is fair to believe that man is neither good nor bad. For practical purposes, Gandhiji wanted to infuse the sense of feeling that man should be considered inherently good, then it would inspire, later on, that man would work in the direction which would lead to goodness. So Gandhiji also did not deny, the assumptions of Hobbes and even of Marx that man is also a selfish animal and at the same time other-regarding animal. That is both these instincts are there and it depends upon the dcvelopment of one aspect of the instinct of man over another aspect. So Gandhiji did not deny the existence of selfishness.

Dr. K. N. Tewari :—Whether man can be developed to that extent ?

Dr. K. M. Prasad :—Yes, ideally speaking man can be perfected. That is the ideal stage. Nobody can say when the ideal stage will be reached. Ideally he is expression of perfection which cannot absolutely be relised in full, it can be only realised in part.

Dr. Ramji Singh :—What would be the relevaace of Satyagrah with those who do not believe in the inner goodness of man ?

Dr. K. M. Prasad :—There is no question of any particular individual's belief. That is scientifically proved fact that man possesses at least some element of goodness, that has simply to be developed.

Dr. Ramji Singh :—Suppose, I do not believe this. Is your Satyagrah relevant to me or it loses its relevence ?

Dr. K. M. Prasad :—I will convience you to believe. The belief can be changed. There is change of heart. There is change of opinion.

Sri Govind Rao Deshpande :—Some body says that the principle of non-violence has failed. How far is it correct ?

Dr. K. M. Prasad :—You can not say that the principle of non-violence has failed. Gandhiji himself tried his best to infuse the spirit of non violence in the minds of Indians. But do you believe that all the Indians or most of the Indians or substantial portion of the Indians adopted the method of non-violence ? No, they did not. So Gandhiji tried his best. Other Gandhians also made efforts to bring about Hindu-Muslim unity. They might have succeeded to some extent according to you. They might have not succeeded to some extent. But they made their efforts. So the question is not of achievement of an ideal. The question is only of making efforts to the right direction. Do you mean to say that Gandhiji's effort was not in the right direction ? I think Gandhij's effort was in the right direction. He might have failed in his efforts, that is a different thing.

Sri S. S. Chakrabarty —It is my opinion that Gandhiji's conception of non-violence and Satyagrah suffered from certain basic fallacies, because he practised it against a country or a nation which was very much civilised, that is, the British. I am afraid how far his conception should be successful, if he had practised it against some other nation, even a European nation. So far as the Britishers are concerned they are very law abiding. They are basically law abiding

and even Dr. Rabindra Nath Tagore, in many of his writings has said– "I shall have to think what would have happened to India, if instead of the British, the French or the Dutch or any other European gooernnents or any other nation of Europe had occupied it, because they do not have that kind of conscience or law abiding nature as the Britishers have." Now because Gandhiji practised non-violence and Satyagrah, against pretically the then most civilised nation of the world, an example of this would be found, in the very first sentence of imprisonment uttered against him by the very first judge in 1921. The judge who sentenced him to a long time imprisonment, paid him the highest compliments and called him the noblest person in the world. Now this would not have been done by any nation of the world. So, he got all his conceptions, because he practised it against such a nation which was very much civilised. For example, Martin Luther King, the Negro Leader of America. has been trying to practice Satyagrah against Americans, but Americans are not Britishers. They have been beating the Negros black and blue and have been lynching then.

There is second fallacy also. I feel that a perfect conception of non-violence does not go with Satyagrah. Non-violence means ultimately, non-resistence to evils. The ideal, the perfect, known non-violent person in the history of world was Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ never resisted evil, he even went to the Cross without wishing evil against his enemies. He said three things which a non-violent man must accept. The *first* thing he said was, "Turn your right chick to your enemies when your left is struck." The *second* thing Jesus Christ said, "Pay unto Caesar what is Caeser's and were very much tyranized by them. Christ said: Do not resist and pay what is due to him. The *third* most important thing Jesus Christ said is, *Resist not evil.*" That is final teaching of Jesus. If you have a philosophical look at this, then we will come to the conclusion that nothing is evil in the world. What is evil in relation to me, might not be evil in relation to some body else. For example, if some body steals and takes away money from my pocket, he enriches himself. Some other human being is being rich. In fact at one time somebody said that even if the money is not going to the poor people and the rich are becoming richer and the poor are becoming poorer, we might take consolation in our thought that after all the richer persons are the Indians. So, I think this is an ideal case of non-violence. Of course, this seems to be very funny and makes a fun of non-violence, when ultimately a person becomes a true non-violent, like Vaishnava, he will

not exist and even kill himself for the sake of others. Even if a violent person wants to take away his country, take away his property, the ideal non-violent person will not rexist.

Dr. K. M. Prasad :—The success of Satyagrah does not depend upon the sufference of the opponent. It depends upon the intensity or amount of non-violence exercised or exerted by the Satyagrahi himself. So I cannot agree to your view that had Satyagrah been offered against any body other than the Britisher, it would not have been succcssful. It would have depended upon Satyagrahis and not upon the adverseries. No body can be considered to be deprived of the spark of goodness. That can be developed or aroused by the Satyagrahis.

Now, about the question of non-resistance and non-violence I think, since Gandhiji came a few centuries after Christ, he developed the principle of non-violent resistance, which was different from mere non-resistance. Gandhiji's method of non-violent resistance may be considered to be superior, more refined, to the method of non-resistance. Non-violent resistance is something deliberate whereas Jesus did not deliberately suffer all the suffering inflicted upon them. Under the force of circumstances they had to suffer. Thus, there is great difference between the two.

Dr. K. R. Gupta :—Satyagrah has got two conditions—one objective and the other subjective. It has not been clear that what are these two points.

Dr. K, M. Prasad :—Satyagrah includes both–subjective and objective conditions. Success of Satyagrah depends upon both. In course of our discussions, just now the example of Sri Subhash Chandra Bose's I. N. A. was cited. So, the objective conditions might have been in favour of the I. N. A. for bringing about the unity among the Hindus and Muslims; the same objectlve conditions might not have been present in India for bringing about the same unity. So many other forces acting in the opposite direction, might have been present there. So, I mean to say that the subjective conditions in Satyagrah are the amount of non-violence exercised by Satyagrahis. But the objective conditions are external conditions. The external conditions do not depend upon the choice of the Satyagrahis.

श्री गोविन्द राव देशपांडे

गाँधी-चिंतन में राजनीति एवं विज्ञान

१. सत्यनिष्ठा

गाँधी ने सत्य का दर्शन अपने जीवन में पाया और जीवन की घटनाओं से आदर्श की ओर बढ़े। जीवन में आयी घटनाओं का समर्थन पुराणों और ग्रंथों में खोजा। प्रथम जीवन बाद में ग्रन्थ। इस तरह गांधी जीवन-निष्ठ था, ग्रंथ-निष्ठ नहीं था। ग्रंथ प्रामाण्य पर जीवन आधारित नहीं था, हालांकि उन्हें अनेक ग्रंथों के प्रति आदर था।

गाँधी ने किसी धर्म संस्था को प्रमाण नहीं माना। मन्दिर, मस्जिद, मोनेस्ट्री, मठ, गुरुद्वारे सबके लिए आदर रखते हुए उसने किसीको भी प्रामाण्य नहीं माना। अंतिम सत्ता-धर्म संस्था की नहीं। धर्म संस्था इतनी पवित्र नहीं मानी कि उसकी रक्षा के लिए मानव का मानवीय संबंधों का बलिदान दें।

किसी पुरुष को, खलीफों को गाँधी ने प्रमाण नहीं माना। गाँधी ने बड़े पुरुषों का अध्ययन किया, अनुसरण नहीं किया। उनसे प्रेरणा पायी, उनसे आगे बढ़ने की।

ग्रंथनिष्ठ नहीं, संस्थानिष्ठ नहीं, व्यक्तिनिष्ठ भी नहीं केवल सत्यनिष्ठ था। सत्यनिष्ठ याने किसी उपाधि से जो बंधा हुआ नहीं है।

इसीलिये अनेक प्रयोगों के लिये वह सिद्ध था। बदलती हुई परिस्थिति से अपने विचारों को परखने को तैयार था। वह गतिहीन नहीं था। नित्य नूतन-सा सृष्टि का क्रम है। वही विज्ञान का गुण है। वही गाँधी का गुण था इसलिये वह विज्ञानानुकूल था। परिणामस्वरूप वह केवल किसी छोटे दायरे में सोचता नहीं था। उसने सर्वोदय कहा- 'सर्व' याने 'विश्व', 'सर्वोदय' याने 'विश्वोदय' बहुजन हिताय नहीं सबजन हिताय। जब उन्होंने देखा कि ईश्वर के अनेक रूप हैं और भिन्न-भिन्न विचारों के लोगों के भिन्न-भिन्न ईश्वर हैं तब गाँधी ने "ईश्वर ही सत्य है" सूत्र को छोड़कर "सत्य ही ईश्वर है" इस सूत्र का प्रतिपादन किया। सत्य की खोज उसने जीवन के दैनंदिन व्यवहार में करने का प्रयास किया। परमार्थ और व्यवहार को दो भिन्न सत्तायें नहीं मानीं।

कहा जाता है जीवन जीवन है, तत्वज्ञान तत्वज्ञान है। दोनों में अन्तर है जैसा पूर्व और पश्चिम में अन्तर है। गाँधी ने कहा तत्व-ज्ञान और जीवन में अंतर भले ही हो, विरोध नहीं है। जब जीवन में तत्वज्ञान से विरोध होता है तब मानवता की मूर्ति खंडित हो जाती है। तब गाँधी ने व्यवहार को तत्वज्ञान के सिद्धान्तों की दिशा में निरन्तर प्रगति का सुझाव दिया। तत्वज्ञान जीवन से संबंधित न रहने के कारण उसके बारे में आदर और आस्था नहीं रही। किसी ने कहा—तत्वज्ञान माने अंधा आदमी, अमावस्या को अंधेरी कोठरी में काली बिल्ली खोजता है, जो वहाँ है ही नहीं। वास्तव में जीवन में तत्वज्ञान का

अधिकाधिक प्रवेश्य अत्यन्त वांछनीय और आवश्यक है। धर्म, जीवन से रुठकर मृत्यु उपरान्त जीवन और परलोक के साथ जुड़ गया। तत्वज्ञान बुद्धि तक और धर्म परलोक तक। परलोक याने जहाँ जीवन का प्रवेश नहीं है। तब गाँधी के सर्वधर्म-समन्वय का अर्थ प्रचलित रूढ़ार्थ से चलनेवाला धर्म नहीं था बल्कि सत्यनिष्ठा ही था। तत्वज्ञान निरपेक्ष और परलोक-निष्ठा के विरोधी—ऐसी सत्यनिष्ठा गाँधी-जीवन का रहस्य है।

२. साधन-शुद्धि

गाँधी जीवन का दूसरा रहस्य साधन-शुद्धि के आग्रह में है। अनुचित साधनों द्वारा वांछनीय साध्यों की प्राप्ति अशक्य है। युद्ध द्वारा शांति नहीं हो सकती। इसी तरह शोषण की प्रणाली से समृद्धि नहीं आ सकती है। समता तो आ ही नहीं सकती। साधन-सुचिता के आग्रह से साधन और साध्य के बीच का भेद भी क्षीण हो जाता है। मनुष्य मनुष्य के साथ रहना चाहता है। अकेला जो नहीं सकता, जी नहीं लगता। लेकिन मनुष्य को मनुष्य से अलग करनेवाले कई तत्व जीवन में आज दाखिल हो चुके हैं। सत्ता, सम्पत्ति, सम्मान –ये सारे मनुष्य को मनुष्य से अलग करते हैं। इनका विसर्जन निरुपाधिक मानवीय सम्बन्धों के लिये जरूरी है।

३. मानव-निष्ठा

साधन-शुचिता का परिपाक दूसरी एक विशेषता में हुआ—वह था, मानव-निष्ठा। No label could be placed on his thought except that of humanism. केवल मानवता, पूरी मानवता—यही गाँधी का विचार-क्षेत्र था।

४. विज्ञान की दिशा

आज के हमारे समय में विज्ञान की प्रगति के कारण एक तरफ समृद्धि और दूसरी तरफ सर्वनाश का दृश्य उपस्थित हुआ है। युद्ध के शस्त्र और शास्त्र में असीम बदल हुआ है। शास्त्रों का विकास साहस तथा पराक्रम को विकसित करने में बाधक हुआ है। अब युद्ध में शौर्य नहीं क्रौर्य (क्रूरता) की आवश्यकता है। निरपराध निःशस्त्र लोगों की निरंकुश हत्या ही व्यूह रचना (strategy) बनी है। एक राष्ट्र या राष्ट्र-समूह विरोधी-राष्ट्र का और राष्ट्रों का हृदय से द्वेष करने पर आमादा हो जाता है। वैसा होना युद्ध की सफलता के लिये आवश्यक हो गया है। उसी तरह शत्रुराष्ट्र की तरह अधिकांश जनता को नष्ट या घायल करना युद्ध में जरूरी हुआ है। इस व्यूहरचना के अनुकूल शस्त्र बनाये गये है। हजारों मील दूर से शस्त्रों का उपयोग किया जायगा और लाखों लोगों को हताहत किया जायगा। आणविक शस्त्रों से मानव जाति का अस्तित्व ही खतरे में आ गया है। ऐसे समय में वह विचार जो पूरी मानवजाति की भलाई का प्रयास करता है—एकमेव आशादीप है।

५. राजनीति-चक्र

राजनीति के क्षेत्र में दिनप्रतिदिन शासन का बल बढ़ रहा है। इतनी और ऐसी सत्ता राज्य के हाथ आ रही है कि जो मानव को सदा के लिये दबाये रख सकती है। सत्ता का केन्द्रीकरण जितना अधिक होगा उतना यह खतरा अधिक बढ़ता जायगा। परिणामस्वरूप मानव एक स्वतंत्र नागरिक की तरह जीवन व्यतीत नहीं कर सकेगा। इस प्रकार आज का राज्य बहुत अधिक शासन करता है। न्यूनतम शासन करनेवाली शासन-प्रणाली अच्छी होती है। अधिकतम् शासन करनेवाली निश्चित रूप से व्यक्तिगत स्वतंत्रता के लिये अहितकर होती है। सत्ता में भ्रष्टाचार निहित है और सर्वाधिक सत्ता सार्वत्रिक भ्रष्टाचार लाता है। इसका दृश्य आपके राजनैतिक दलों के व्यवहारों से स्पष्ट हो जाता है। पहले सौदा बाजार में होता था और राजनीति ही सौदेबाजी का पर्याय बन गयी है। जहाँ सौदा होता है, वहाँ ईमान नहीं होता। इसलिये समाजवाद ने नयी कल्पना रक्खी कि बाजार भी न हो और सौदा भी न हो। व्यापार भी न हो, सौदेबाजी भी न हो। लेकिन अब व्यापार की सौदेबाजी राजनीति में होने लगी है। राजनीति सचमुच आज वारांगना की तरह अनेकरूपा है। पैसा जब लोकसत्ता में दाखिल हो जाता है तब लोकसत्ता बाजार में उतर जाती है। सौदा होने लगता है और ईमान का सफाया होता है। अधिकतम् सत्ता पर कब्जा करने के लिये निम्न श्रेणी के साधनों का व्यवहार कर नीलाम की तरह बोली बोली जाती है। रिश्वत का उपयोग तो होता ही है। सार्वाधिक सत्ता पर कब्जा करने के लिये सार्वाधिक भ्रष्टाचार होने लगता है।

६. लोकनीति

इसका उपाय गाँधी की दृष्टि में सत्ता का विकेन्द्रीकरण है। कम-से-कम सत्ता अधिक-से-अधिक लोगों के हाथ में रहे—यह विकेन्द्रीकरण का सच्चा अर्थ है। यह मानवीय स्वातंत्र्य की रक्षा के लिये अत्यन्त जरूरी है। लेकिन लोकतंत्र की प्रणाली में ही कैसे? आज का शासनतंत्र जिस प्रकार का बना है, उसमें कुछ सत्ता केन्द्रित रहेगी ही। उसे चलाने का काम प्रतिनिधि करेंगे। लेकिन प्रतिनिधित्व रहते हुए भी प्रतिस्पर्धा नहीं। क्योंकि प्रतियोगिता और प्रतिस्पर्धा से लोकतंत्र के मूलभूत सिद्धान्तों पर ही आक्रमण होता है। प्रतिस्वर्धा हटेगी तो Diplomacy का अन्त होगा और Duplicity समाप्त होगी। सरलता आयेगी तब कहीं सामान्य नागरिक जिन्हें हम "लोक" कहते हैं वे लोकतंत्र में सच्चे रूप से शामिल हो सकेंगे। इस तरह निर्वाचन कायम रखते हुए भी उम्मीदवारी समाप्त होगी। उम्मीदवारी होड़ है, निर्वाचन सम्मति का तंत्र है। तब गाँधी को अभिप्रेत राजनीति में नियंत्रण कम आजादी अधिक, शासन कम अनुशासन अधिक, प्रतियोगिता से अधिक सम्मति और सौदे की जगह ईमान। इस व्यवस्था को उपस्थित करने का आधार दंड (force) नहीं बल्कि सम्मति (consent) होना चाहिए। जहाँ दंड समाप्त होगा वहाँ औपचारिक लोकतंत्र (formal democracy) की जगह वास्तविक लोकतंत्र (real democracy) आयेगी क्योंकि लोकतंत्र और दंडशक्ति परस्पर विरोधी संस्थायें हैं। सम्मति (वोट) एवं शास्त्र साथ-साथ नहीं रह सकते।

वोट की प्रक्रिया वास्तविक तब बनेगी जब मनुष्य-मनुष्य के संबंधों में राज्यसत्ता का प्रवेश कम-से-कम होगा। राजसत्ता तीन रास्तों से मानवीय संबंधों में प्रवेश करती है—१. पुलिस और फौज २. अदालत और कचहरी ३. जेल और दंड। इन तीनों का उपयोग कम-से-कम हो, इस प्रकार की शैक्षणिक संस्थाओं में पुलिस और फौज का प्रवेश जिन कारणों से त्याज्य और अवांछनीय है उन्हीं कारणों से समाज में भी निषिद्ध होना चाहिये। साथ-साथ व्यक्तियों के आपसी सम्बन्धों में कानून का प्रवेश कोई नहीं चाहता। तब कानून का स्थान भी निषिद्ध माना जाना चाहिये। जहाँ कानून नहीं वहाँ जेल की भी जरूरत नहीं। सजा की जगह शिक्षा लेगी। तब भद्र व्यवहार में और भी अधिक भद्रता का विकास होगा। इन तीन संस्थाओं का कम-से-कम उपयोग जहाँ है वही सही स्वतंत्रता है। इसके लिये चाहिये कि पारस्परिकता बढ़े। परस्पर जीवन के लिये उत्तरदायित्व बढ़ें। दो व्यक्ति एक दूसरे के जीवन के लिये जिम्मेवार बनते हैं तब स्वतंत्रता आती है। पड़ोसी के जीवन के प्रति कर्त्तव्य की भावना और पड़ोसी के प्रति प्रेम का व्यवहार जितना बढ़ेगा उतना ही शासन की जगह स्वयं शासन आयगा। राज्य-सत्ता के विकेन्द्रीकरण के लिये गाँधी ने व्यवहार के लिये यह दीक्षा देने का प्रयास किया। आज इसकी आवश्यकता अनिवार्य है।

इसीके लिये यह जरूरी है कि पक्षमुक्त लोकनीति का प्रयास हो। पक्ष या राजनैतिक दल का अर्थ ही है—सत्ता के लिये संगठन (A party is opinion organised for power. Its main function is to capture power and retain it at all costs) सत्ताकांक्षा दल के संगठन की मुख्य प्रेरणा होती है। सत्ताकांक्षा से सत्तास्पर्धा के साथ-साथ सत्ता-संघर्ष आता है। इसीलिये दल के संगठन का अर्थ ही है– लोकहित के विरुद्ध में षड़यंत्र (a conspiracy against the people). इस षड़यन्त्र का अंत तब आयेगा जब पक्ष (party) की जगह जनता (people) लेंगे।

७. विकेन्द्रित अर्थतन्त्र

केन्द्रित सत्ता व्यक्तिगत स्वतंत्रता का अपहरण करता है। इसीलिये विकेन्द्रित सत्ता के लिये विकेन्द्रित अर्थ व्यवस्था जरूरी है क्योंकि केन्द्रित व्यवस्था में शोषण चलता है। आज सार्वत्रिक गरीबी और सार्वत्रिक शोषण भी है। शोषण उत्पादन और वितरण दोनों में है। जबतक व्यक्तिगत मालिकी में उत्पादन के साधन रहेंगे तबतक शोषण मिट नहीं सकता। जबतक जरूरत की चीजें, जरूरत वालों को नहीं मिलती तबतक चीजों का कब्जेदार जरूरतवालों को सता सकता है।

गाँधी ने इसके सम्बन्ध में जो उपाय बताये हैं वे संक्षेप में निम्न हैं।

(क) जरूरत की चीजों के उत्पादन के साधन समाज की मालकियत में होने चाहिये।

(ख) उत्पादन के औजार काम करनेवालों के कब्जे में होने चाहिये।

(ग) जरूरत की चीजें जरूरतमंद को मिलनी चाहिये।

(घ) विनिमय से सौदा, स्पर्धा, सट्टा, सूद और मुनाफा का अंत होना चाहिये।

आज एक तरफ से भाव-नियंत्रण द्वारा मुनाफा घटाया जाता है, दूसरी तरफ कर-वृद्धि द्वारा संग्रह कम किया जा रहा है। इसमें शासन की जबर्दस्ती की जगह सम्मति का व्यवहार होना चाहिये। ऐसा अर्थतंत्र बने कि जिसमें शोषण, संग्रह मालकियत, और मुनाफा की प्रेरणा नहीं रहे। विकेन्द्रित उद्योग ही इस तरह का अर्थतंत्र उपस्थित कर सकता है।

८. यंत्रवाद

यंत्र का स्वागत या विरोध यह प्रश्न अप्रस्तुत है। मुख्य और मूल बात यह है कि शोषण नहीं, यह है। गाँधी यंत्र-विरोधी नहीं था–शोषण विरोधी था—जो यंत्र या यंत्रोद्योग मानव का शोषण कर सकते हैं उनका गाँधी विरोधी था। लेकिन वह विज्ञान को तो चाहता था। यह अलग बात है कि आज का विज्ञान दृष्टि विहीन है। उसे मानवनिष्ठा की दृष्टि देनी चाहिये। तब विज्ञान से उत्पन्न साधनों के बारे में चुनाव करना आवश्यक हो जाता है। विज्ञान के विषय में गाँधी की दृष्टि सहानुभूति के होते हुए भी समझदारी की थी। विज्ञान विपन्नता को हटाने में सहाय्यभूत हो, विनाश को टालें। आज विज्ञान जिस रास्ते से जा रहा है उसमें विनाश के रास्ते जाने की उसकी गति अधिक तेज है। उसे उस रास्ते से हटाकर समृद्धि के रास्ते चलने में गाँधी विचार सहायक हों सकता है। अतः विज्ञान को भी शोषण-मुक्ति की दीक्षा देना जरूरी है। शोषण-मुक्त समाज आज के युग की माँग है।

९. भारत की सद्यःस्थिति में क्या गाँधी का उपयोग है?

इस प्रश्न का उत्तर इतिहास में है। जिस प्रकार सारा समाज ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद के के नीचे कराह रहा था, अपने आपको हतवीर्य, हतबल, हताश और नि:सत्व पाता था तब गाँधी ने उसमें जान फूँकी। एकतंत्र का मुकाबला करने को तैयार किया। राह बतायी एवं प्रेरणा की। आज स्वतंत्रता के २० साल बाद, विज्ञान की प्रगति के बावजूद भारतीय समाज चेतनहीन-सा मालूम होता है। और जब चेतना प्रकट होती है तब उसका रूप ही विकृत दिखायी देता है। राजनीति के क्षेत्र में धाँधली, रिश्वत, सौदेबाजी, जाति-वाद सत्ता की होड़ नजर आती है। उत्पादन के क्षेत्र में तो मानों एक तरह से हड़ताल जारी है, लाखों-करोड़ों किसान देश की सस्याओं के प्रति उदासीन है और उत्पादन में जी-जान से खपना नहीं चाहते हैं। वे सचमुच एक आदर्श की राह देख रहे हैं। कौन-सा आदर्श हो? गाँधी ने ग्राम स्वाराज्य का आदर्श रक्खा है। उसे इन अनगिनत, मूक

ग्रामीण नागरिकों के सम्मुख रखना होगा। तब कहीं जान आयेगी। और ग्राम स्वराज्य आयेगा लोगों के अपने अभिक्रम से, पुरुषार्थ से, अपनी प्रतिज्ञा से। उसका पथ होगा, पारस्परिक प्रेम, उसका वाहन होगा सामूहिक प्रयास और उसका आदर्श होगा शोषण-मुक्त, शासन-निरपेक्ष समाज का निर्माण।

DISCUSSION (चर्चा)

डा० केदार राम गुप्ता :—गाँधीवाद का व्यावहारिक रूप का एक आचार—दर्शन का रूप ले लेता है। व्यक्ति का ठीक आचरण करे, समाज में उसे मान्यता मिले, समाज भी उसे अपनाये, वह चाहे शासन के क्षेत्र में हो या अस्त-व्यस्तता के क्षेत्र में हो। तो फिर यह प्रश्न आ जाता है कि उस आचार-दर्शन को आदमी ग्रहण करे, उसके लिये परिस्थितियाँ भी काम करती हैं। लेकिन अनुभव तो बदलते रहते हैं परिस्थितियों के मुताबिक। आज हमारे देश में जो परिस्थिति मौजूद है, उसमें हम नहीं पाते कि किन से प्रेरणा मिले कि गाँधीजी का बताया हुआ आचार-दर्शन हम व्यवहार में लावें। अभी अपने देश में एक राजनैतिक उथल-पुथल आया हुआ है। जल्द-जल्द शासन बदलते रहते हैं और शासन में वे लोग हैं, तो कौन आचार-दर्शन उन पर आरोपित किया जाय जिससे आपस में सद्भाव, और पारस्परिक सम्मति की उत्पत्ति हो ?

श्री गोविन्द राव देशपांडे :- जब मैं कह रहा था कि गाँधी ग्रंथ-निष्ठ नहीं था, व्यक्ति-निष्ठ भी नहीं था, जीवन-निष्ठ था, तो मेरा मतलब यह था कि नई बदलती परिस्थिति में वे नए तरीके भी ढूंढ़ निकालने की काबलियत रखते थे। अगर वह कंटेक्सट, वह परिस्थिति आज नहीं रही है जो उन दिनों थी, तो आज की नई परिस्थिति के लायक नया तरीका देने की क्षमता भी रखते थे। लेकिन गाँधी व्यक्ति तो अमर थे नहीं, इसलिये गाँधी जी ने जो दिया है, उसमें से कुछ मूल्यों को केवल हम पकड़ रख सकते हैं। एक दर्शन होता है एक दिशा होती है। मूल्य तो वे होते हैं, जो सार्वकालिक होते हैं वे सार्वत्रिक होते हैं, जो उस वक्त काम आया और बाद में भी काम आ सकेगा। तो कुछ मूल्यों का ही निर्देश गाँधी व्यवहार से, गाँधी विचार से होना चाहिये।

हमारी यह मान्यता है और गाँधी जी की भी मान्यता थी उन दिनों में जब उनके साथियों में मतभेद हुआ और पाकिस्तान उनकी इच्छा के विरुद्ध बना तो उनको लगा कि अगर हमें अपने साथियों को बदलना है तो जनता को भी बदलना होगा। इसलिये आज राजनीति में जो धांधली दिखाई देती है, उसको अगर बदलना है या रोकना है तो जनता को बदलना होगा। यह शायद गाँधीजी का आदेश था जो उनकी अपनी प्रणालियों में से दिखाई देता है। मैं शायद शब्द जानबूझ कर इस्तेमाल करता हूँ। मेरा अपना व्यक्तिगत विश्वास निश्चित है कि यही है। शायद इसीलिये कहता हूं नहीं तो गाँधीजी के साथ न्याय नहीं होगा, क्योंकि वे आदमी ही ऐसे थे कि जो आज थे वह कल नहीं। नित्य नूतनता गाँधीजी की विशेषता थी।

डा० रामजी सिंह—इन जटिल प्रश्नों पर सर्वसम्मति संभव भी कैसे है ?

श्री गोविन्द राव देशपांडे :—आपने जो पूछा कि एकमत, अल्पमत या बहुमत (unanimity, minority or majority) के मामले में गाँधीजी सचमुच चुस्त थे या नहीं, तो मेरा कहना यह है कि उनकी अपनी जितनी संस्थाएँ थीं, उन सभी संस्थाओं में उन्होंने सर्वसम्मति (unanimity) के ही कानून को लगाया था। उनके जितने साथी होते थे सबों को उन्होंने सर्वसम्मति (unanimity) के ही रास्ते पर लगाया था। ऐसी बात नहीं थी कि जो संस्था न करे वह राष्ट्र न करे। वे यह जरूर चाहते थे कि राष्ट्र का नाम सर्वसम्मति से ही चले। इस सर्वसम्मति की बात को विनोबा भावे ने जिस तरह से स्पष्ट किया है, उसको भी हमें थोड़ा समझ लेना चाहिए। वह उतनी चुस्त चीज नहीं है जितनी आज की बहुमत और अल्पमत की चीज है। जैसे विनोबा ने कहा कि चार तरह से सर्वसम्मति (unanimity) जाहिर की जा सकती है एक ही आदमी के मत से जैसे गाँववालों के लिये ब्रिज बनाने के लिये एक ही आदमी का मत काफी हो सकता है। दूसरी बात यह है कि अल्पमत के अनुसार फैसला हो सकता है, जैसे अल्पमत (minority community) के हित और अहित के बारे में उनका अपना फैसला हो मैजोरिटी के लिये बाध्य होना चाहिये। कुछ चीज जिसमें किसीका अहित होने वाला नहीं है, बल्कि आज सुख ही मिलेगा इसमें बहुमत को मानने में बाधा नहीं है। ऐसे फैसले जिसमें शिक्षा का सवाल है—कौन सा विषय है या नहीं है, जो समाज (community) में सबों को प्रभावित करता है इसमें एक मत यानी सर्वसम्मति को मानना चाहिये। फिलहाल सर्वसम्मति की जो परिभाषा है, उसमें एक मत, जो आज के बहुमत या अल्पमत के सिद्धान्त में नहीं बैठता है, वह भी बैठता है।

श्री धीरेन मजुमदार

गाँधी-विचार की सार्थकता

(समावर्त्तन-भाषण)

इस विद्वत् गोष्ठी में रामजी बाबू मुझे यहाँ लाए हैं । मैं ऐसी गोष्ठी में आने के लायक नहीं हूँ । मैं तो फील्ड वर्कर हूँ और खासकर देहात का फ़ील्ड वर्कर हूँ । किसी गोष्ठी का उद्घाटन तो आसान होता है क्योंकि कहने को कोई खास विषय नहीं रहता है । लेकिन किसी गोष्ठी का समावर्त्तन कठिन होता है क्योंकि उसकी चर्चा में कुछ देना होता है और मैं अपने को इसके उपयुक्त नहीं समझता हूँ । समावर्त्तन करनेवाले के ऊपर कुछ जिम्मेवारी होती है । उसे कुछ समाधान प्रस्तुत करना पड़ता है । रामजी बाबू ने जो कुछ कहा उसे मैं सुन जरूर रहा था, लेकिन बहुत कुछ समझ नहीं सका क्योंकि मेरी मर्यादा अपूर्ण है और उनकी मर्यादा पूर्ण । इसके अतिरिक्त और लोग अंग्रेजी में जल्दी-जल्दी बोल सकते हैं और मैं हिन्दी में भी धीरे-धीरे बोल सकता हूँ । दूसरी बात यह है कि आपलोगों की चर्चा शास्त्रीय है । आपलोग शास्त्राचार्य हैं और मैं नहीं । आपके भाषण में बहुत से टेक्निकल शब्द ऐसे हैं कि जिनमें ऐसी स्पीरिट है कि जो शास्त्रीय सूत्र पकड़ लेते हैं उससे आपकी मर्यादा बढ़ जाती है । लेकिन वह सभावाला मामला मुझसे दूर है । मैं सिर्फ इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस चर्चा को बड़े गौर से सुन रहा था मानो कि मैं कुछ समझ ही नहीं रहा हूँ । इसका एक बड़ा कारण यह है कि मुझे बड़ा अच्छा लग रहा था । गाँधीजी को इस दुनियाँ को छोड़े हुए २० साल बीत गये । उनकी मृत्यु के दो साल पूर्व में दौड़कर उनसे मिलने गया था । मैं यह जानने के लिये गया था कि गाँधीजी समाज की किस तरह से रक्षा का प्रयास कर रहे हैं । मैंने देखा कि पूरे देश के समाज के कल्याण के लिये उनका प्रयास जारी था । गाँधीजी का समाज के प्रति जो विचार था आज २० साल के बाद उस पर आपलोग गंभीरतापूर्वक चर्चा कर रहे हैं, देश के हित के लिये ही नहीं बल्कि पूरे मानव-कल्याण के लिये, इसलिये भी मुझे आपकी चर्चा बड़ी अच्छी लग रही थी । तीसरा कारण यह है कि दो-तीन और इस प्रकार की गोष्ठियाँ मैंने देखी हैं । राजस्थान में, कानपुर में, दिल्ली में और बिहार में भी एक बार । उन गोष्ठियों में गाँधीजी की समाज के प्रति विचार-धारा का अध्ययन एवं विचार-विमर्श हुआ था । मैंने उनमें प्राण नहीं देखा था । इस गोष्ठी में मैंने प्राण देखा है और इसलिये भी अच्छा लग रहा था । हो सकता है कि मेरा अन्दाजा गलत हो जिसमें प्राण होगा वह सर्जनशील (प्रोडक्टिव) होगा और जो निष्प्राण होगा वह कुछ सृष्टि नहीं कर सकता । अच्छा लगने का एक कारण यह भी है कि गांधीजी जैसे मौलिक और सामाजिक क्रांतिकारी के विचार को शास्त्रीय सूत्र में बाँधकर सोचा जा सकता है । जैसा कि आप जानते हैं कि प्रोफेट और फिलास्फर दोनों दो चीजें हैं । इसका माने है कि प्रोफेट के प्रोफेसी (prophecy) को फिलौसोफी में परिणत करने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है । इसलिये मुझे अच्छा लग रहा था । यद्यपि मैं मानता हूँ कि प्रोफेट को फिलौसोफी की चहारदिवारी में घेर कर ले आने का प्रयास उचित नहीं है क्योंकि प्रोफेट प्रोफेट है ।

मैं अपनी ओर से कुछ विचार आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ । इन विचारों पर

आपलोगों को सोचना है। मैं देख रहा था कि गाँधीजी के एक-एक आइटम पर चर्चा हो रही थी। होना ही चाहिए। एक तस्वीर है गाँधीजी की सोशल, पौलिटिकल, मौरल, स्पोरिचुअल आदि जिसका चूल से चूल मिला है। यह साइंस का युग है, यह भौतिक युग है। आजकल किसी चीज को समझने का और रिसर्च करने का जो शास्त्रीय ढंग है उसमें एक वाक्य है—Other things being constant." तो Other things being constant जब कहा जाता है तो गाँधीजी के किसी भी एक हिस्से पर आप नहीं सोच सकते हैं। उनके सभी हिस्सों पर गौर करना होगा। जब हम समाज-दर्शन की पृष्ठभूमि में विचार करेंगे तो यह भी विचार करना होगा कि समाज की बन्दिश के लिये उनका दर्शन क्या है, वे चाहते क्या हैं? मिसाल के रूप में अभी खादी की बात चल रही थी, याने कुटीर उद्योग। खादी के सामने कई संकट हैं, दाम ज्यादा है, खादी का स्टॉक जमा हो रहा है—इत्यादि इत्यादि। अब समाज जैसा है, तो समाज से संचालित पौलिटिक्स, इकौनोमिक्स भी वैसा ही होगा। इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन रहे, यंत्रमूलक समाज रहे और हम उसमें चर्खा को मिला दें, तो वह इकोनोमिक्स नहीं होगा, वह सोशल सेक्युरिटी होगी। हम इकौनोमिक्स को पौलिटिक्स से अलग (आयसोलेट) नहीं कर सकते। इसी तरह से हम एक लिमिटेड चीज को ले लें कि अमुक नेता ने यह कहा और उसके प्रतिकार पर हम सत्याग्रह करेंगे, बाकी समाज का ख्याल न करेंगे, तो यह उचित नहीं है। गाँधी ने किया था इसको जरूर, लेकिन उन्होंने सत्याग्रह इस प्रकार नहीं किया था। वह तो सीविल रेजिस्टेन्स था। अहिंसा एक चीज है और शांतिमय तरीका दूसरी चीज है। Anything *civil* is not *non-violence*. वे सिविल रेजिस्टेन्स इसलिये कहते थे क्योंकि उनको कराना तो पब्लिक से था। उनकी अहिंसा (नन-वायलेन्स) को किसी ने स्वीकार नहीं किया। कांग्रेस में गाँधीजी नाक रगड़ कर रह गये कि स्वाराज्य प्राप्ति के लिये साधन-स्वरूप अहिंसा को माना जाय लेकिन उसे वे पास नहीं करा सके थे। उनको इसे छोड़ना पड़ा। बात यह है कि गाँधीजी का जो भी काम हुआ उसके पीछे सत्य का आग्रह था। इसीलिये वे सैन्यशक्ति का कोई सुन्दर विकल्प (civilised substitute for armed brigade) ढूँढ़ रहे थे। उस समय की परिस्थिति ही ऐसी थी। गाँधीजी ने कहा था कि सत्याग्रह के शोध का अवसर शायद मेरे जीवन में नहीं मिलेगा, मेरे मरने के बाद कोई अवश्य सत्याग्रह का शोध करेगा। यह सोचने की बात है। समाज कितना ही अच्छा कितना ही आदर्श हो जाय, उसमें विकृति तो रहेगी ही। तो विकृति का मुकाबला कैसे करेंगे? जैसा कि अभी आप कह रहे थे कि आज समाज में हिंसा समस्या से समाधान का एक साधन है। मैं पूछता हूँ—किस रूप में? आपको एहसास होगा इसलिये नहीं कि हम हिंसा पसन्द करते हैं, बल्कि इसलिये कि दूसरा विकल्प नहीं है। हम साफ-साफ नहीं देख पा रहे हैं कि हम समस्याओं का समाधान अहिंसा से करेंगे तो समस्या का समाधान कैसे होगा? बल्कि हम तो यह देखते हैं कि जब से इतिहास का आरंभ हुआ तब से आज तक हिंसा ही साधन रहा है। केवल नैतिक दृष्टि से ही नहीं बल्कि धर्म-संस्थापन के लिये भी युद्ध की केवल इजाजत ही नहीं दी जाती

थी बल्कि आदेश भी दिया जाता था। इतिहास में जाने पर पता चलता है कि कितने ही धर्म-युद्ध हुए हैं। क्रूसेड (crusade) और जिहाद बहुत हुए है। ऐसे समय में आज मानव एक सिचुएशन पर, एक चैलेन्ज पर अगर अनशन कर रहा है कि अहिंसा नहीं छोड़ेंगे तो यह कैसे संभव है? जब तक विकल्प सामने नहीं आए, हिंसा को कैसे छोड़ेंगे? हम नाव पर बैठकर नदी पार कर रहे है। हम जानते हैं कि नाव में छेद हो गया है और नाव डूबेगी। हम तैरना भी नहीं जानते। ऐसी हालत में जान-बूझकर नाव में बैठ कर मैं अपने को डुबाउँगा नहीं, बल्कि नाव से कूदकर पानी में छलांग लगा दूँगा। तो ऐसी ही स्थिति आज की है। ऐसी ही स्थिति में हम घिसे हुए हैं।

इसलिये गाँधीजी को अगर हम समझना चाहते हैं, उनके विचारों पर गौर करना चाहते हैं, उनके उद्देश्य पर शोध करना चाहते हैं तो समाज के संदर्भ में रह कर विचार करना होगा। आज ही के समाज के संदर्भ में उनकी बातों पर रिसर्च करना होगा। सोशल सर्विस की जरूरत है। आज निःशास्त्रीकरण की बात होती है, निःसैनिकरण की चर्चा होती है। उसका नाम गाँधीजी ने सत्याग्रह रखा है। सत्याग्रह का दो नाम है। एक है non-violent assistance और दूसरा है non-violent resistance. Assistance और Resistance दोनों चीज नहीं है, दोनों एक ही हैं। क्रिया की प्रतिक्रिया होती है। यह साइंस है। तत्वज्ञान है। हिंसा से प्रतिहिंसा होती है, अहिंसा-से-अहिंसा होती है और प्रेम-से-प्रेम होता है। यह विज्ञान का जमाना है। हम साइंस के आधार को देखकर सत्याग्रह पर विचार करने की बात करें। यह ठीक है कि गाँधीजी ने सत्याग्रह किया था लेकिन वह किस तरह का सत्याग्रह था? वह ब्रिटिश साम्राज्य के खिलाफ था। उस समय की परिस्थिति ही ऐसी थी जिसमें वे सत्याग्रह के कारण सफल हो सकते थे। उस समय के अनुकूल था वह। अगर ब्रिटिश सरकार न होती तो शायद ऐसी बात नहीं होती। जैसे मान लीजिए कि पाकिस्तात हमारा एक पड़ोसी मुल्क है और उसने हम पर हमला किया। पाकिस्तान के हमला करने पर आपने उसको हरा दिया। तो कोई आपसे पूछे कि पाकिस्तान के बजाय अगर चीन आप पर हमला करे तो क्या आप उसको हरा देंगे? मतलब यह है कि सुरक्षा की मौजूदी पद्धति अब काम नहीं करेगी। हमको तैयारी नहीं है, हमको शक्ति नहीं है, हममें नेशनलिज्म नहीं है, तब ऐसी स्थिति में जब पाकिस्तान से बड़ी शक्ति हम पर हमला करेगी तो हम हार सकते हैं। पाकिस्तान छोटी शक्ति था इसलिये हम जीत गये। इसी तरह से सत्याग्रह का प्रश्न हमारे सामने हैं। सत्याग्रह उसी समय के लिये उपयुक्त था। उस समय के लिये उसमें शक्ति थी लेकिन अब साइंस का युग है और साइंस की शक्ति बहुत बढ़ गई है। अब सत्याग्रह का वह स्वरूप कारगर नहीं हो सकता। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि हमें तत्व को देखना चाहिए। गाँधीजी ने जितनी तैयारी देखी उसके अनुसार ही व्यूह रचना किया. आज हमको अपनी तैयारी के अनुसार कार्य करना है। मूल तत्व है क्रिया और प्रतिक्रिया। यह विज्ञान है। क्रिया-प्रतिक्रिया पर गाँधीजी ने कार्य किया, हमें भी क्रिया प्रतिक्रिया के अनुसार चलना होगा। गाँधीजी ने आवश्यकता के अनुकूल कार्य किया और

आज आवश्यकता के अनुकूल हमको भी तैयारी करनी है। हमको आवश्यकता के अनुसार चीजों पर जोर देना है। एक व्यक्तिगत साधना का श्रम होता है लेकिन पूरे सामाजिक रूप से साधना के श्रम का फल कुछ और ही होता है।

अभी रामजी बाबू ने लिखकर मेरे पास पूछा है कि गाँधीवाद में आदर्श और व्यवहार के भेद के संबंध में कुछ कहूं। मैं आदर्श और व्यवहार को दो चीजें नहीं मानता। दोनों एक ही चीज है। जब वांछनीय स्टेज पर रहता है तो आदर्श है और जब प्राप्तव्य स्टेज पर रहता है तो व्यावहारिक है। एक ही बात है। आज आप अहिंसा की बात करते हैं। मैं पूछता हूँ कि अहिंसा की तुलना में आप किस चीज को लायेंगे ? आज हम ईसामसीह को तुलना में नहीं ला सकते, क्योंकि उस समय अहिंसा की आवश्यकता थी, परन्तु आज के युग में, विज्ञान के युग में, अहिंसा में सफलता नहीं है। मनुष्य को जीवन-संग्राम (struggle for existence) में जरूर विजय होगी। गाँधीजी ने समाज को, मनुष्य को जीवन रक्षा के लिये, जीवन की समस्याओं के समाधान के लिये डाइरेक्शन दिये। हमें उनके निर्देश (directions) को समझने की चेष्टा करनी है। वे एक प्रोफेट थे। उनके डाइरेक्शन पर हम सोचें, विचार करें, शोध करें, अनुसंधान करें, शास्त्र बनावें। उसके बाद एक हिंसात्मक प्रतिरोध के बदले में अहिंसात्मक प्रतिरोध का शास्त्र तैयार करें। इसीलिये मैंने आरंभ में कहा है कि यह गोष्ठी की चर्चा मुझे अच्छी लगी क्योंकि शास्त्र आप तैयार कर सकते हैं, मैं नहीं तैयार कर सकता। मैं इसलिये शास्त्र तैयार नहीं कर सकता कि मैं एक फील्ड वर्कर हूँ : Prophet's message is carried by the philosophers and scholars. यह जितना सही है, उतना ही सही यह भी है कि prophet's message is developed not by the learned people but by the shepherd boy तो लोगों ने इसको विकसित किया। इसलिये गाँधीजी ने आपके सामने एक सिद्धान्त रखा, सत्याग्रह का। आज निःशस्त्रीकरण और निःसैनिककरण इत्यादि की बात होती है, मगर यह बात इस युग की समस्याओं के समाधान के लिये चैलेन्ज में नहीं आ सकती। आज के युग में यह स्टैन्ड नहीं करता है। कार्लमार्क्स एक फिलौसफर था। उसने एक दिशा लोगों को दी और लोगों ने उसमें शोध करके आगे कदम बढ़ाया। गाँधीजी एक प्रोफेट थे। उन्होंने भी एक दिशा मानव कल्याण के लिये दुनिया को दी। हमलोगों को इस पर शोध करना होगा और समस्याओं का समाधान निकालना होगा। समाज की आर्थिक हालत को सुधारने के साथ-साथ उनकी सोशल हालत को भी सुधारना होगा। इस समाज के अंदर नई दिशा का प्रसार करना है। मानवता और संस्कृति को साथ लेकर चलना होगा। हमें समग्र सोशल सोसाइटीज कायम करनी होगी। लेनिन ने मालिक और मजदूर सबको बराबर कर दिया और वह मजदूर अब मालिक के सिर पर चढ़ गया। लेनिन ने पूरे समाज को बदल दिया। उसकी संस्कृति को बदल दिया जिसका फल यह हुआ कि मानवता और संस्कृति दोनों का दिवाला निकल गया। उसको आर्थिक और सांस्कृतिक क्रांति कहते हैं। लेकिन जब तक वर्गविहीन समाज की दिशा में आप आगे

नहीं बढ़ेंगे, तब तक उनका बेसिक एजुकेशन आगे नहीं बढ़ेगा। आपका देश एक विकासशील देश है. एक अर्द्ध विकसित देश है। यह देश औद्योगिक एवं सांस्कृतिक रूप से भी अर्द्धविकसित है। तो ऐसे समय में विकास की जो प्रक्रिया है उसको शिक्षा का माध्यम होना चाहिए। दोनों दृष्टि से होना चाहिए। एक तो परिस्थिति है, दूसरा शिक्षा-शास्त्र की दृष्टि से। आज दुनियाँ में मूर्त से अमूर्त की ओर जाने का प्रयास है। अधिक-से-अधिक लोग जा रहे हैं। ऐसा क्यों होता है? आप लोग देखते हैं स्कूल और कॉलेज में किसकी कसरत होती है? क्या बुद्धि की कसरत होती है? आप इसको गहराई से देखें तो मालूम होगा कि स्मरण-शक्ति की कसरत होती है, चाहे वह टेक्निकल एजुकेशन हो चाहे वह जेनरल एजुकेशन हो। आप शिक्षा शास्त्री हैं, आपको सोचना है कि स्मृति की कसरत के माध्यम से सही शिक्षा हो सकती है? जानकारी (instruction) भले ही हो जाय, लेकींन शिक्षा (एजुकेशन) नहीं होगा। तब हमें शिक्षा पद्धति को ऐसा करना होगा कि वह केवल बौद्धिक नहीं। बौद्धिक व्यायाम का मतलब यह होगा कि आप समस्या का समाधान करते हैं। बात असल में यही है। यह वैज्ञानिक बात है। इसलिये वैज्ञानिक ढंग से इस पर सोचना होगा।

यह साइंस का युग है। इसमें साइंस और टेक्नोलौजी का चैलेन्ज हमें स्वीकार करना है। पुराने जमाने में जो परिवर्तन ५०० वर्षों में होता था अब २० वर्षों में २५ वर्ष में ही उतना परिवर्त्तन होता है। आपके पास ५ वर्ष का बच्चा शिक्षा ग्रहण करने के लिये आता है। २५ वर्षों के बाद जब वह इस शिक्षा से निकल कर जीवन संघर्ष में प्रवेश करता है और अगर आप अबतक की परिस्थिति के संदर्भ में लिखी हुई कितावों के सहारे उन्हें शिक्षा दी है तो उसकी क्या हालत होगी, इसको आप सोच लीजिये। तो जब नित्य परिवर्तन हो रहा है, ऐसी हालत में समय के अनुकूल यदि हम बच्चों को शिक्षा देदें और कार्यप्रणाली के साथ शिक्षा को यदि नहीं छोड़ेंगे तो you will put the cart before the horse इस तरह के जीवन-संघर्ष में वे कामयाब नहीं होंगे। मेरा मतलब यह है कि समाज के खिलाफ, परिस्थिति के खिलाफ आपकी यह शिक्षा व्यवस्था नहीं चल सकती। इस शिक्षा-व्यवस्था को बदलना होगा। इसमें समय के अनुसार, साइंस के अनुसार आपको परिवर्तन करना अनिवार्य है। ऐसा नहीं करने से न तो व्यक्ति का कल्याण होगा, न समाज का कल्याण होगा, न देश का कल्याण होगा और न मानवता का कल्याण होगा। आप शिक्षा-शास्त्री हैं, आप इस पर विचार करें। साइंस के युग में रह कर हम रुढ़िवादी बनकर नहीं रह सकते।

दूसरी बात में डिमोक्रेसी के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। साइंस और डिमोक्रेसी आज कल दुनियाँ में चल रही है। आज सभी डिमोक्रेसी की बात करते हैं। आप देखिये, कोसीगिन आजकल रूस में 'सोशल डिमोक्रेसी' की बात करते हैं। कुछ लोग 'बेसिक डिमोक्रेसी' की बात करते है, कुछ लोग और आगे बढ़ गये हैं और वे "पीपुल्स डेमोक्रेसी" करना चाहते हैं। डिमोक्रेसी को (prestige issue) बना लिया है।

आखिर डिमोक्रेसी की माँग क्या है ? उसकी मांग यह है कि आदमी को इतनी तालीम अवश्य होनी चाहिए जिससे कम-से-कम वह यह निर्णय कर सके कि इलेक्शन में किसकी नीति समाज के लिये हितकर होगी और किसकी नहीं । यह मतदाताओं की न्यूनतम माँग है। (This is the minimum demand of voters) अगर इतना नहीं होता है तो वह डिमोक्रेसी नहीं है। वह कुछ और चीज होगी। कोई पैसा देकर वोट खरीद लेगा कोई मार-पीट कर वोट ले लेगा, कोई किसी और तरह से वोट प्राप्त कर लेगा, तो वह गुंडातंत्र या कोई और तंत्र होगा, मगर वह लोकतंत्र नहीं हो सकता। तो एजुकेशन की जिम्मेवारी है कि अच्छे और बुरे को परखना सिखा दे। आज कल के ग्रेजुएट का जो हाल है वह सबों को मालूम ही है। तथ्य-तथ्य है। उसको २० साल शिक्षा दी जाय मगर वह अपने वोट का उचित रूप से प्रयोग न कर सके तो अवश्य उसको न्यूनतम शिक्षा नहीं मिली। वह समाज को प्रक्रियाओं को क्या समझेगा और समाज के लिये क्या कर सकता है ? होना यह चाहिए कि समाज के लिये जो-जो कार्य जरूरी हैं सबकी शिक्षा उसको उचित रूप से दी जाती। हम चरखा को माध्यम बनावें या किस अन्य चीज को, यह प्रश्न हुआ करता है। आपके यहाँ प्राइमरी स्कूल है, बेसिक स्कूल है, सेकेन्डरी स्कूल है और हायर सेकेन्डरी स्कूल भी है और रिसर्च इंस्टीच्यूट भी है। इन सबों को प्रोत्साहन दीजिये। इसका सिलेबस ठीक तरह से तैयार करें। मैं इस सिलसिले में थोड़ा हिन्ट्स दे देता हूं। आज के जमाने में अगर कोई बुढ़िया किसी गाँव में चर्खा लेकर बैठे तो उसका पेट तो भरेगा ही नहीं संस्कृति गई चूल्हे में। इसलिये आपको साइंस का प्रोडक्शन करना है। आपकों कृषिक्रांति (एग्रीकल्चरल रेवोल्युशन) करना है, आपको औद्योगिक क्रांति (इंडीस्ट्रियल रेवोल्युशन) करनी है आपको विकेन्द्रीकरण (डीसेन्ट्रलाइजेशन) करना है। केन्द्रीकरण (सेन्ट्रलाइजेशन) जब सभ्यता (सिविलाइजेजन) तक पहुँच गया है तो सेन्ट्रलाइलेशन रखते हुए निरकुंश राज्य-व्यवस्था (Totalitarianism) से हम नहीं बच सकते। फिर इसके लिये सैन्य-शक्ति चाहिये ही संचालित समाज सैनिक शक्ति के विना चल नहीं सकता। हिंसा से मुक्त होना है तब भी संचालित समाज ऐसी हालत में नहीं चलेगा। ऐसी हालत में क्या आप चरखा चला सकेंगे ? नहीं, आपको साइंस की ओर जाना होगा, आपको पावर और टेक्नोलौजी की ओर जाना होगा। पावर और टेक्नोलौजी का प्रोडक्शन आपका लिमिटेड है। बिजली का प्रोडक्शन भी आपका लिमिटेड है। कोयला आपके पास थोड़ा ही है। एटोमिक इनर्जी आपके पास लिमिटेड है। अगर समाज में सबका आप हित करना चाहते हैं तो आपको ऐसा पावर खोजना होगा कि सबको सुलभ हो और वह असीमित (अन-लिमिटेड) हो। मिसाल के रूप में तीन पावर मैं बता सकता हूँ। एक सोलर शक्ति है दूसरी पृथ्वी की गर्मी है और तीसरी आकाश का कम्पन है। अगर इन पर आप कंट्रोल नहीं कर सकते हैं तो टेक्नोलौजी को इतना बढ़ाना होगा कि वह सबका साथ दे सके और सबका हाथ चल सके। अगर अल्पतंत्र का बहुतंत्र तक उदय करना चाहते हैं तो टेक्नोलौजी को इतना आगे बढ़ाना होगा कि सबका हाथ चल सके। आज कल क्लास पर क्लास पास कर लेने से क्या होता है और उन्हें क्या वेतन मिलता है।

खाक और पत्थर। साधारणतः उन्हें १००) रु० प्रतिमास मिलता है जिससे क्या हो सकता है इसके बावजूद भी वे नौकरी ही पसन्द करते हैं मगर टेक्नीकल चीज नहीं सीखेंगे। जेनरल एजुकेशन में आजकल कुछ नही रखा है। आजकल साइंस और टेक्नोलोजी का जमाना है। आप पौलिटिक्स और इकोनोमिक्स को साथ-साथ ले चलें। दोनों को अलग नहीं कर सकते हैं। तभी आपका उत्पादन (प्रोडक्शन) और सामाजिक सम्बन्ध (सोशल रिलेशन्स) ठीक से चलेगा। आजकल की डिमोक्रेसी में सबों को ऐसी ही शिक्षा देनी होगी। आपको साइंटिफिक और टेक्निकल वातावरण तैयार करना है। कोई आदमी माँ के पेट से ही साइंस या टेक्नोलौजी सीख कर नहीं आता। हमें हर घर को उद्योग से भर देना है जिसमें बच्चे माँ के पेट से ही टेक्नोलौजी सीख कर और उद्योग सीख कर पैदा हों। हमें सोलर इनर्जी को विकसित करना है। हमें टेक्निकल इनर्जी को विकसित करना है। यह तभी संभव है कि आप ऐसा वातावरण तैयार करें ताकि समाज इस युग का साथ देने योग्य हो सके। हरेक आदमी को उसकी इच्छानुसार एक विषय मिलना चाहिए और उसके चिंतन के अनुसार उसे कार्य मिलना चाहिए, तभी उसका मानसिक विकास संभव है और तभी वह आगे चल कर अपने उद्देश्य में सफलता प्राप्त कर सकता है। मेरा मतलब यह है कि कोई न कोई उद्योग उसके घर में होना चाहिए कि वह माँ के पेट से टेक्निशियन बनकर पैदा हो। किसीको उसकी मनोवृत्ति के अनुसार काम दीजिये। प्राइमरी स्टेट में छोटे-छोटे उद्योग हो सकते हैं। क्लासों में उन्हें इसके संबंध में पढ़ाया जाता है। लेकिन प्रैक्टिकल ट्रेनिंग उसको संतोषजनक नहीं दी जाती है और वह किताब में केवल पढ़कर ही रह जाता है। जैसे मान लीजिये आज २० साल से कोशी प्रोजेक्ट चल रहा है। वहाँ काम करने वालों, कंट्रैक्टरों, मजदूरों आफीसरों वगैरह की कतार लगी हुई है। वह एक युनिवर्सिटी बन गया है। जो लड़के इंजीनियरिंग में जाते हैं, जो ऐग्रीकल्चर में जाते हैं, क्यों नहीं उन्हें अच्छे मजदूरों के साथ काम करने के लिये अनुभव और ट्रेनिंग का अवसर प्रदान किया जाता हैं? उनको मनोवृत्ति के अनुसार वहाँ उन्हें काम मिल सकता है और वे बड़ी कुशलता से और सुचारु-रूप वहाँ काम कर सकते हैं। वे वहाँ. जाकर प्रैक्टिकल ट्रेनिंग लेकर अपने काम में पक्के हो सकते हैं। लेकिन हमारे यहाँ ऐसा नहीं होता है। लड़कों को वहाँ नहीं भेजा जाता है। तो इस प्रकार नेशन की डिफरेंट लेयर की जो क्रियायें हैं—सामाजिक कार्य जैसे पंचायत इत्यादि, इसमें कुछ प्रोब्लम्स हैं जिनके समाधान के तरीके निकल सकते हैं। इसी प्रकार से सिलेबस तैयार किया जा सकता हैं। तो इस तरह से गाँधीजी जिस अहिंसक समाज की कल्पना कर रहे थे उस कल्पना को सामने रखकर के हम अमल करेंगे तो समस्या का समाधान होगा।

आखिर में मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूं। गाँधीजी एक प्रोफेट थे। मानवता की जो चुनौती है उसके समस्याओं के जो समाधान हैं, उसके लिये गाँधीजी प्रोफेट थे। उन्होंने मार्ग बता दिया जिस पर हमें चलना है। गाँधीजी ने साफ कहा था कि गाँधीवाद कोई चीज नहीं है गाँधी ही एक चीज है। उन्होंने कोई शिष्य-मंडली नहीं बनाई। उन्होंने कोई संप्रदाय नहीं बनाया। वे सांप्रदायिक भावना के विरोधी थे। इसलिए आज गाँधीवादी समाज नहीं होना चाहिए। गाँधीजी शिक्षा के अनुसार आज विनोबा भावे